DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 061 08 AC 003 131

By-Rogin, Lawrence, Rachlin, Marjorie

Survey of Adult Education Opportunities for Labor. Labor Education in the United States. Final Report.

American Univ., Washington, D.C. National Inst. for Labor Education.

Bureau No-BR-6-2262

Pub Date Sep 68

Grant-OEG-2-7-062262-1918

Note-329p.

Journal Cit-IAR-Research Bulletin: v8 n2 Feb 1968

EDRS Price MF-$1.25 HC-$16.55

Descriptors-*Continuing Education Centers, Instructional Staff, *Labor Education, *Labor Unions, Libraries, National Organizations, *National Surveys, Participation, Program Descriptions, Program Length, Public Schools, Religious Cultural Groups, Research, Residential Programs, State Universities, *Universities

In the United States, most labor education is conducted by labor unions and university centers; it is not universally available throughout the country, but rather concentrated in the industrial northeast and middle west. National unions representing about half of the labor unionists conduct most of the education, they determine their own activities and only a few run major programs. Some education is run by local unions, the national AFL-CIO, and its state and local affiliates. Twenty-seven university centers, mostly located at state universities, conduct programs, but most labor education is at least union sponsored; programs provide training in union skills or education about unionism. It is usually in short, self-contained units, conferences, short courses, and brief residential schools but there are some longer residential programs and some continuing education courses, especially in the social sciences. Recent changes include more continuing study, more broad social issues, more sophistication in methods, more staff training, and more university centers and unions supporting education. (authors/ly)

BR 6-2262
PA-08

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-2262
Grant No. OEG-2-7-062262-1918

SURVEY OF ADULT EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR LABOR

September 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ED023061
AC003131

Final Report
Project No. 6-2262
Grant No. OEG-2-7-062262-1918

SURVEY OF ADULT EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR LABOR

Labor Education in the United States

Lawrence Rogin and Marjorie Rachlin

National Institute of Labor Education
at The American University

Washington, D.C.

September 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Table of Contents

Preface vi

Chapter I Summary and Conclusions 1

Chapter II Introduction 11

Union Structure in the United States 14

U.S. Labor Education History 15

Chapter III Research Method 26

Chapter IV Union Education 31

National Unions 32

Program Descriptions 33

Locally Initiated Education in National Unions 67

The American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations 72

AFL-CIO State Central Bodies 75

AFL-CIO Local Central Bodies 80

Staff Training 83

One-Week Resident Schools 96

Community Services Education 105

Chapter V University Labor Education Centers 122

University Program Descriptions 124

Short Courses 157

Conferences 165

Long-Term Programs 169

Special Projects 182

Joint Labor-Management Programs 186

Table of Contents

Chapter V (continued)

Research and Education 187

Center Structure and Staffing 188

Relations with Unions 191

Use of Resources 194

Chapter VI Other Institutions in Labor Education 198

Catholic Labor Education 198

Public Libraries and Unions 201

Universities Without Labor Education Centers 206

Local Public Adult Education 209

Community Colleges 211

Vocational Education 213

Cooperative Extension 215

U.S. Government Agencies 216

Civil Rights Organizations 221

Some Other Organizations 223

Chapter VII Some Specific Aspects of Labor Education 228

Course Content 228

Materials 229

Evaluation 235

Training Unionists as Instructors 241

Developing New Labor Educators 245

Organizations of Labor Educators 246

Problems of Labor Educators 249

New Problems for Labor Education 251

Appendices

I Responding Organizations 255

II Staff Training: History and Program Descriptions 259

III Students at American University Short Courses 269

IV Effective Cooperation Between Universities and Unions in Labor Education 273

V University Questionnaire 276

VI National Union Questionnaire 289

VII Local Union Questionnaire 305

VIII State Central Body Questionnaire 311

IX Local Central Body Questionnaire 315

X Vocational Education Questionnaire 320

List of Tables

Table

IV-1 Types of National Union Education Activity, 1965 and 1966 32

IV-2 National Union Education Staff, 1967 64

IV-3 Local Education in the International Association of Machinists, 1967 68

IV-4 Some State AFL-CIO Education Programs, 1966 77

IV-5 Union Staff Training, 1965 and 1966, National Union Programs 85

IV-6 Union Staff Training, 1965 and 1966, Inter-Union Programs 87

IV-7 Union Staff Training, 1965 and 1966, Training at National Union Staff Meetings 88

IV-8 University Training of Union Staff, 1965 and 1966 89

IV-9 One-Week Resident Schools for Local Unionists, 1965 and 1966 97

Tables (continued)

IV-10 One-Week Resident Schools for Local Unionists at University Labor Education Centers, 1965 and 1966 103

IV-11 Community Services Local Educational Activity, 1966 113

IV-12 Community Services Local Classes, by Subject, 1966 114

IV-13 Community Services Local Conferences, by Subject, 1966 .. 116

V-1 Education Programs at University Labor Education Centers, 1965 and 1966 124

V-2 University Short Courses, 1965 and 1966 158

V-3 Comparison of Enrollments in Extension Classes of Selected Universities 160

V-4 University Conferences by Length and Type, 1965 and 1966. 166

V-5 Comparison of Enrollments in One-to-Four-Day Conferences Sponsored by Selected Universities 168

V-6 Long-Term Programs 173

VI-1 Types of Services Provided by Libraries to Unions 204

VI-2 Initiative For Contact Between Libraries and Unions 205

Preface

I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in labor education without whose cooperation this study would not have been possible. I hope they find that their efforts have contributed to a document that is useful to them and also to those concerned with the entire field of adult education.

There is an unevenness in the treatment of various topics. For some important areas little information could be obtained. There is a great deal of detail on certain programs about which little has heretofore been written. Some duplication was unavoidable because of the interaction of labor education institutions and because the report deals both with institutions and kinds of programs.

Some labor educators will be disappointed because the report does not explore our philosophical arguments. That was not its purpose.

Mrs. Agnes Douty worked as professional assistant in the early stages of the study but was unable to continue. Her place was taken by Mrs. Marjorie Rachlin. Mrs. Rachlin and I gathered information and prepared program descriptions. She is responsible for the sections on one-week schools, long-term programs, Catholic labor education, and materials. Her advice was invaluable throughout. The technical consultant, Dr. Harold Sheppard, was particularly helpful in the preparation of the questionnaires and tables and in suggesting areas for interpretation. I am deeply grateful to Miss Sonia Cohen whose contributions to the study went far beyond her official position as secretary.

Lawrence Rogin
Project Director
National Institute of Labor Education

CHAPTER I

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Labor education or workers' education (in the United States the terms have the same meaning) is the branch of adult education that attempts to meet workers' educational needs and interests as these arise out of participation in unions. It is education directed toward action. Its programs are intended to enable workers to function more effectively as unionists, to help them understand society and fulfill their obligations as citizens, and to promote individual development. It does not include training in job skills for the labor market, commonly known as vocational education.

Labor education is important because trade unionism is a major institution in the United States. National policy accepts collective bargaining as a basic method of dealing with employer-employee relations; and it is here that unions make their greatest impact. But union concerns go beyond the workplace into many areas of community and national life. If education is meaningful in a democratic society, then the education of unionists about their problems as unionists and citizens is significant to the quality of their participation. In 1938 a Presidential Advisory Commission on Education put it this way: "If an intelligent labor movement is essential to democratic progress, then the education of labor leaders is as important as the education of financiers and engineers."

Labor education has special significance for adult educators because it is an attempt to involve workers in educational programs through their functional organization, reaching them through their unions and developing educational programs around the needs that emerge from their activity in the union. This is in contrast to the community or individual approach of most nonvocational adult education in this country.

This report is an attempt to describe the present state of labor education in the United States. It includes an analysis of the institutions involved and of the various types of programs conducted. Attention is paid to the labor education structure within the unions and universities, to the interrelationship between these institutions, and to the problems of labor education as seen by those who conduct the programs. The study is based on data for the years 1965 and 1966, gathered by questionnaire, correspondence, and reports. This information was supplemented by personal interviews with a large number of labor educators, including the directors of all major programs. Some information for the period after 1966 has been included when it seemed valuable. Since many unions do not keep complete records of their activities there is no effort to provide complete statistical information such as the total number of unionists involved in labor education. When statistics for specific activities were available they are used.

The first widespread labor education efforts in the United States were developed in the early 1920's. A few unions had started programs before this and others became involved at this time. However, the official labor movement did not make education a major concern. Several independent labor education agencies were established, drawing support from some unions, adult educators, and interested individuals. While there were many evening classes, there was also a great deal of resident education, most of it six weeks or longer. Labor education grew during the 1920's even though unionism was not strong. The growth was greatest among the independent agencies.

The rapid growth of unions during the New Deal was accompanied by an increase in labor education. More unions started programs, particularly those in the mass-production industries, and there was stronger support from the national federations. Federal relief funds supported widespread activity as long as money was available. Long-term resident education became less significant, and most labor education became practical to the immediate needs of the unions. The independent agencies continued their work, but they became proportionately less important. Catholic labor education began to expand.

The period since the end of World War II has seen the expansion of a new institution in labor education, the university labor education center, almost always part of a state university. There has also been an increase in the number of unions involved, including many that had not been involved earlier. The independent agencies, however, were unable to find financial support and ended their activity. There was a sharp increase in Catholic labor education in the 1940's but this began to decline in the next decade, and has continued to do so.

At present most labor education in the United States is conducted by unions and university labor education centers. There is still some labor education conducted by Catholic institutions. There is also some involvement by universities without labor education centers, by libraries, by public adult educators, by some U.S. government agencies, and by some organizations that have other primary purposes.

Because labor education reaches workers through their unions, nearly all the programs conducted by organizations other than unions are sponsored jointly with a union. This may be a national union or one of its locals or other subordinate units, a local or state central body, or the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations. This joint sponsorship usually applies to the specific activities. In addition, all of the university labor education centers have machinery for union consultation on their entire programs through an advisory committee.

In the United States there is no national, comprehensive system of labor education. Each institution develops its own program as it sees fit. This is true for the individual unions as well as the other organizations that sponsor labor education. Labor education is therefore a fragmented field, each union and each university center determining how much it will do and developing its own priorities, its own methods of operation, its own materials, and its own program identity. The few examples of cooperation among university centers and among unions do not alter the general picture. No one institution or organization of labor educators has thus far provided leadership to overcome this fragmentation.

Opportunity for labor education is not universally available to unionists in different unions or in different geographic areas. On the contrary, the variations are so great that for some unionists in some places there are numerous programs while for others differently situated there are none at all. The major determining factors are whether the union to which the worker belongs sponsors education and how much; what the state and local central bodies do; and, often most important, whether there is a university labor education center in the area and the amount and character of its activities.

Almost all labor education in the United States is directed toward those unionists who are active in their organizations, either as volunteers or as paid staff or officers. The major attention is concentrated on the local union activists, usually volunteers and local officers, who make up about ten percent of the total union membership. However, there are very few unions, if any, in which ten percent of the membership are engaged in education. In most cases the proportion would be far less. Most labor education is open to inactive union members, but very few attend except in some unions that make an effort to educate new members. Some labor education is conducted for full-time union staff, and the number of this type of program has increased in recent years. Very little labor education is directed to the top leaders of the unions, those at the policy-forming level.

Most labor education is directed toward increasing the students' competence to function in the union and toward their understanding of unionism and its role at the workplace and in society. Many programs, therefore, relate to such traditional union activities as bargaining, organizing, and the administration of a democratic institution. As unions have broadened their involvement in politics and legislation, more programs have dealt with political and social issues, some narrowly related to the immediate concerns of union members, others dealing with the general concerns of the total society. A few highly intensive programs have treated social issues in depth. There has been an increase in the number of courses in the social sciences, which use workers' union interests as the basis for a broad education and individual development. Quite recently there have been some attempts to assist unionists to achieve formal educational goals such as a high school diploma or college credit.

Labor education uses forms common to adult education: short, intensive conferences, one-week resident schools and occasionally longer resident terms, and evening courses, most of them running seven to ten sessions but some for a full semester or, rarely a full academic year. There is almost no correspondence education. The short conferences are probably the most numerous and draw the largest enrollments, but exact figures are not available. The one-week resident school is also widely used. Part-time classes make up the largest part of the education that is conducted in the home communities of the unionists. Most labor education activity is in self-contained units: that is, each conference, course, or resident school has its own function, which is completed when the program is over. However, in recent years university centers have sponsored an increasing number of long-term evening programs consisting of a series of courses which provide opportunity for continuing broad education. There have also been some experiments with longer periods of resident training, both for local unionists and staff, but these are not common.

Unions and universities employ labor education specialists to administer and conduct programs. These specialists have expertise in program development, subject matter competence in major areas of labor education content, and an ability to teach adults. Part-time instructors are used for some programs. They may be unionists, academic faculty, government employees working in agencies related to the problems under consideration, or others whose experience makes them useful. The ability to teach adults is an important consideration in selecting instructors. As the result of experience over the years, the discussion method is the most popular teaching technique, and various discussion aids have been developed in order to involve students in the learning process.

Union Education

The greatest amount of union education is that conducted by national unions. About 40 of the more than 180 national unions in the United States reported that they sponsor some educational activity. These include some of the largest unions so they represent more than half of the over-18-million unionists in the country. Most of these unions conduct a few regular educational activities, but a few of them run major programs which make a serious attempt to reach throughout the union. In 1967, 34 of these national unions reported the employment of 192 persons for educational purposes: 94 worked full time on education; the rest, part time. Forty-two of the total worked for a single union; no other union had nearly that many.

There is no typical national union educational program. Those unions that provide major support for education will generally make an effort to sponsor training for local activists throughout the union, but the forms of such training will vary. In some unions there is emphasis on political and social issues, while others will restrict their education to that related to narrow union tasks. Some unions work closely with university labor education centers; others, equally concerned with education, do all of their own education and training.

The union reports showed that full-time conferences lasting one to three days are the most common educational activity of national unions, 34 unions holding them; but figures are not available for the number held or the number attending. Twenty-two national unions conduct one-week resident schools for local union activists. During 1965 and 1966 there were 253 such schools with an enrollment of 19,085. Just over 200 of these were conducted by 7 large unions. Eighteen unions conducted specially organized training of full-time staff, ranging from two-day conferences to one instance of a six-month combination of academic and union training. Enrollment in national union staff-training programs was 2,511 in the period of the survey.

Some local unions and other subordinate units of national unions conduct education. In very few national unions there is a special effort to develop local programs; in most the initiative is left to the local units. As a result there is the same variation in the amount and character of locally initiated education as exists among national unions. In general, locals of unions with national education programs are more likely to carry on their own education, but some imaginative local education programs are in locals that have no nationally sponsored activity. Much local union education is developed in cooperation with university labor education centers. Unions responding to our questionnaire indicated that there were 156 persons locally employed for education, 53 of them working full time for that purpose. Of the total, 50 were in one major union which has a large decentralized educational program.

Some special educational programs are conducted by the AFL-CIO Department of Education, but the primary function of the department during the period of the study was to promote labor education and to assist national unions and state and local central bodies. The department also coordinates labor education activity among unions and between unions and universities. It has been especially active in staff training and one-week resident schools. The department is also a source of labor education materials. Some other AFL-CIO departments are also involved in labor education. The most important of these is the Department of Community Services which conducts education nationally, mainly in conjunction with local central bodies. These programs are concerned chiefly with out-of-plant problems of workers. In 1966 there were 197 community services courses enrolling 7,556, and 115 conferences enrolling 11,125, in 87 communities.

In addition to the community services education mentioned above, some AFL-CIO state and local central bodies conduct other programs, with the state organizations taking greater initiative. Here, again, the variations are great; a few organizations conduct major activity, others a few programs, and many nothing at all. One-week resident schools are the most prevalent educational activity of state central bodies, 26 of these being held in 1966 with an enrollment of 2,444. These schools were sponsored by 29 state organizations, some schools jointly by several states. Active state central bodies also run a number of educational conferences. Many local central bodies work with university centers in the development of educational programs for unionists in their communities.

University Labor Education

During 1965 and 1966 there were 24 formally established university labor education centers, mainly in the industrial east and midwest. Since then three new centers have been established. Two centers have a single special purpose: one, a 13-week resident staff-training program; the second providing conferences for elected national union officers. The others are the major resource for community-based labor education in the United States. In addition they conduct resident training for both local unionists and full-time union staff, and a number of programs with a special emphasis, usually in some area of social concern.

All but three of the university labor education centers are part of state-supported institutions. They have no common structure within the universities: some are part of industrial relations centers; some located in extension divisions; some attached to academic departments. They also vary greatly in size and in the amount of financial support they receive. A few centers can provide labor education without charge or at very low cost; others must retrieve all costs except administration. Between is a wide range. There is also variation in emphasis between centers that concentrate most of their effort on programs that meet immediate needs of unionists and centers that seek to provide a greater proportion of broad training with an academic orientation. Many centers try to do both and this trend is growing.

Whatever the location in the university, labor education is essentially an extension activity. Aside from the two specialized centers mentioned above, all centers conduct short courses for local unionists in cooperation with local unions or central bodies. During the two-year period of our survey there were 1,066 short courses, enrolling 27,433. During the same period 11 centers ran long-term evening courses providing opportunity for continuing noncredit study. These enrolled 5,884. There were 419 conferences with an attendance of 23,071, ranging in length from one to four days. Some were on campus; others in the home communities of the workers. A variety of programs (68 in all) [illegible] training union staff enrolled 2,323. They included short courses, conferences, one-week resident schools, a few schools that were two weeks long, and some that ran a full semester.

Other Labor Education

During 1966 ten Catholic labor education institutions conducted evening courses for local unionists. Most of the courses were directed to immediate union needs but a few provided opportunity for continuing education. The estimated enrollment in these courses was 3,100. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has a regular training in industrial relations for unionists but there are no figures to indicate the number reached. A few other U.S. government departments provide some labor education or furnish resources for union and university programs. The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare have granted funds for special labor education activity, related chiefly to social problems. Most of these have gone to university labor education centers.

One public school district, Philadelphia, conducts a major program of labor education as part of its adult education activities. Its work is much like that of a university center. This is also the case in the Alabama state vocational education department, which maintains a specialized labor education staff.

Some Concluding Observations

Labor education works. It involves unionists, mostly blue-collar workers, in nonvocational, voluntary, adult education. Unionists do respond to educational opportunity when they are approached through their unions; when the education is conducted under auspices in which they have confidence, in a style that involves them in the learning process, and when the subject matter is relevant to their concerns. Once they are drawn into educational activity and have a successful experience, many worker-students are motivated toward education that is broader in scope, has longer-range goals, or deals with controversial social issues.

Labor education has demonstrated an ability to prepare unionists for action, both in unions and in the community. It can successfully deal with highly controversial subject matter. It is also adaptable to changes in unions and in society, as shown by the recent increase in staff training, the development of long-term programs, and the shifting emphasis in content to current social problems.

Very few unions that initiate educational activity give it up. Rapidly growing unions and unions that face new problems turn to education to help them. The number of university centers continues to increase; some that have had difficulties have reorganized their structure in order to continue to function.

It is important to note that the ability to attract blue-collar workers into educational activity does not coincide with the findings of the adult education surveys such as those made by Gallup in 1957 and 1963, that of the National Opinion Research Center completed in 1963, or the intensive study of a single community, also completed in 1963, in Oakland, California. 1/ The latter is particularly significant because Oakland is a strongly unionized community but without any labor education while the adult education survey was under way. This study found that among those whose union membership was their only organizational tie, active union members were less likely to participate in adult education than inactive members. 2/ Yet all studies of labor education students show that it is the active union members who become involved. It is hard to believe that Oakland unionists are so different from those who do take advantage of labor education opportunities when they are offered.

Despite the demonstration of its ability to attract and involve students, however, labor education is still peripheral, both in the proportion of active unionists reached and as a part of the total adult education in the United States. While it is not possible to say how many unionists are actually involved in labor education, it is clear that only a small percentage participate in any given year. One very large union estimates that about 10 percent of its members do engage in educational programs. This is a rare exception. For most unionists the opportunities do not exist.

We have said that one key to the success of labor education is its approach to students through the union; another is its relevance to the workers' concerns. To reach out, therefore, labor education requires union support. This is true whether the programs are conducted directly by the union or by some other institution such as a university labor education center. Such support gives status to the education as it relates to the union; it provides funds for staff and program, and it makes possible the kind of professionalism that is necessary to imaginative and meaningful education. In a few unions this kind of support is provided; in most it is not. On the contrary, education is frequently ignored or regarded as unimportant in the total activities of the union. One cannot say that in the union movement there is a concern for education.

University centers work in the atmosphere created by the character and extent of union support for education. When they were being established there were some problems in developing mutual confidence and machinery for cooperation between unions and universities, but these difficulties no longer exist. The centers have shown that they can carry worker-students from immediate union needs to education that is much broader. But the very nature of labor education requires that the centers work through the unions to reach their potential students and that they develop the kinds of programs which the unions regard as important. This relationship makes it possible for them to succeed when their is union support for education; at the same time it creates difficulty when education is opposed, ignored, or narrowly conceived, as is the case in many unions and in many parts of the country.

Many of the university centers have demonstrated an ability to develop local support for education among all kinds of unionists. It is possible that if the university resources were far greater, labor education could be built from the bottom up instead of depending upon leadership from the national unions and the federation. In a sense this is what happened in agricultural extension years ago.

But there is little possibility of this kind of support for labor education from the universities. The centers are caught in the familiar trap of extension education in the academic community. They are underfinanced, and many of them must charge such high fees that the programs become self-limiting. They are under pressure, sometimes self-imposed, to carry on work of academic quality, whatever that is, at the expense of what is referred to as service-oriented education. Yet the evidence indicates that unionists are drawn to education by the desire for help in immediate tasks, however much their interests may widen once they are involved.

University centers are the main channel for public support of labor education, and this is likely to remain the situation. But adult education is not more highly regarded by the public schools or the community colleges, so little could be gained by seeking support from those institutions.

At one time it was hoped that there would be an infusion of federal funds to provide a breakthrough in the total amount of labor education, similar to the WPA experience of the 1930's when adequate financing was available. Labor educators still regard this as a possibility but there has been no concerted effort for such legislation recently. It is still possible that union attitudes will change and that labor education will gain the support and status necessary to make it more than a peripheral activity.

Labor education needs a breakthrough in scale that would be made possible by a major increase in financial support. The first impact of such an increase would be the general availability of labor education and the expansion of all types of current programs without the forced choices among them that are now necessary. More money will also support wider experimentation, justified by the success of experimental programs that have already been conducted. Every labor educator can list a number of new programs he would like to try if funds were available, and none has doubts about the ability to attract students to such programs. More money would permit greater attention to materials and the systematic training of labor education specialists. The increase in professionalism and cohesiveness would strengthen labor education as an institution and relate it more closely to the entire field of adult education.

Without such improvements, labor education will continue to grow, but slowly as it has in the past two decades. Unions that do not now support education will begin activity, and others will join the few that now seek to provide educational opportunity throughout their organizations. There will continue to be shifts in program emphasis to meet changes in society and in unionism. But the full potential will be unrealized.

In a brief monograph on adult education in Sweden 3/ Sven-Arne Stahre, director of studies of the Swedish Workers' Educational Association, points out that adult education in that country developed out of the concerns of the "popular movements," of which the organizations of workers were but one. These organizations, Mr. Stahre says, were concerned that their members learned not only about the conditions and objectives of their own organizations but also about the social and economic problems of society at large. They set up their own educational institutions, and these were later supported in part by public funds as it became clear that there was public benefit from their efforts. The result has been a major involvement in adult education of all sectors of the Swedish population, with a considerable program emphasis on the problems of the society.

It may be that U.S. unions have not yet exhibited the same concern for education that is attributed to the unionists in Sweden; but the needs of the society are equally great, and labor education offers a method for aiding a large group of Americans to understand them.

Footnotes

1/ For an analysis of these surveys see Jack London, Robert Wenkert, and Warren O. Hagstrom, Adult Education and Social Class (Berkeley, Survey Research Center, University of California, 1963), pp. 191-204.

2/ Ibid., p. 102.

3/ Sven-Arne Stahre, Adult Education in Sweden (Stockholm, The Swedish Institute, 1965).

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION

Labor education or workers' education (in the United States the two terms are used interchangeably) is a specialized branch of adult education that attempts to meet the educational needs and interests arising out of workers' participation in the union movement. These needs may develop from the workers' membership and activity in the union or from their involvement as unionists in the total society. Labor education is distinguished from general adult education because it attempts to reach workers through the union, by interesting them in education because they are unionists and workers rather than as individuals.

Within this framework labor education encompasses a wide range of content. Some of it, generally described as "tool" subjects, helps to develop the skills needed for the internal operation of the union or to enable it to deal with employers. It would include such subjects as parliamentary law, communications skills, union administration, collective bargaining, steward training, labor law, or industry economics. Some subjects are intended to develop an understanding of trade unionism and a loyalty to it; labor history is one example. Some deal with the position of workers in the society, off the job, or with an understanding of society as a whole. In recent years they have included courses in civil rights, urban affairs, social security, and the relation between wages and prices. But they also include more general courses in economics or sociology or history. Related to the interest in social problems is education dealing with the mechanics of social change through politics and legislation, including courses on legislative procedure, on how political parties operate, or on the specifics of political involvement. Finally there are programs that are focused on individual development, including everything from literacy to the creative arts. Labor education does not include training in job skills for the labor market, commonly referred to as vocational education.

The form of labor education varies. It includes evening classes continuing for varying lengths of time; short conferences; one-week resident schools and some resident programs that run much longer; and a variety of other forms common in adult education.

In the United States two major institutions conduct labor education: unions and formally established university labor education centers. But various other agencies are also involved: for example, public adult educators, university extension divisions, vocational educators, U.S. government departments, and a number of private organizations, including some with a special interest in labor education and others whose primary interest may be civil rights, international affairs, religion, industrial relations, or some other field.

The student body is made up almost entirely of unionists, primarily those who are active in their unions. These include three major groups: interested rank-and-file members; local unionists who carry unpaid responsibility in the union's internal operation or in its relationship with the employer; and the paid staff of the unions. Labor education is voluntary. The students come to class because they are interested, not because they are required to do so. Since the students are unionists, most of the non-union institutions that conduct labor education do so in cooperation with unions and often the programs are jointly sponsored.

Labor education is important in society because unions comprise a major institution in the United States, with about 18 million members representing almost a third of nonagricultural employment. Through collective bargaining, the impact of the unions is primarily economic; but unions are also involved in local, state, and national politics and legislation, in community affairs, and in international relations. It is through their unions as organizations that workers affect all these areas. Labor education takes on added importance because unions area, or are expected to be, democratic institutions in which major decisions are made by vote--not by fiat.

For adult educators, labor education has an additional significance. It is an attempt to involve in education that group of Americans who are most often missing in general adult programs, the blue-collar workers. While the studies of adult education involvement agree that educational attainment is the most important determinant of participation in adult education 1/ the coincidence between blue-collar employment and low educational attainment is so great that it can be safely stated that, in the United States, blue-collar workers participate in adult education to a minor degree compared with white-collar workers and professionals. 2/ Labor education seeks its students functionally, through their own organizations, the unions, rather than through the traditional community channels of general adult education, and this experience may provide a clue to involving all hard-to-reach groups.

The major purpose of our study is to provide an account of the present extent and nature of labor education in the United States. This account identifies the institutions that conduct the programs; the nature of the programs; and, to the extent possible, the number and kinds of participants, with comments on the trends and issues in the field. The report also discusses the structure of labor education within the institutions and other items relevant to the conduct of labor education.

There have been several previous descriptions of labor education, or some major aspect of it, in the United States. The first appeared in 1931, written by Marius Hansome, who included a section on the United States in a book dealing also with developments in Europe. 3/ This book is still the major resource for the early history of labor education. In 1940 the American Association for Adult Education published a study by T. A. Adams 4/ which reviewed the history and extent of labor education to that time. However, the author's unfamiliarity with unionism affects the value of his effort. The most thorough study of labor education was published as a yearbook of the John Dewey Society in 1941, edited by Theodore Brameld. 5/ In this volume a number of practitioners provided history, program descriptions, and an analysis of the problems of that period. The most recent effort to provide a history and description of the entire field as well as an analysis of its social impact was made in 1951. It is an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. 6/ Labor education structure and issues have changed so much since then that this very good study is important primarily as history. In the same year, 1951, Mark Starr, then educational director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, made a survey of existing programs, described briefly by those who conducted them. 7/

There have been three major studies of university labor education: by Caroline Ware in 1946; 8/ by Irvine L. H. Kerrison in 1951; 9/ and by Jack Barbash in 1955. 10/ The first two described the then expanding university efforts and discussed some of the problems of cooperation with unions. The Barbash book described an eight-university project financed by the Fund for Adult Education, which had a governing board made up equally of unionists and university representatives. This study furnished some detail about the nature of the consultative machinery between unions and universities that was being developed at that time.

Labor Education by Joseph Mire, published in 1956, 11/ is the most recent general survey of existing programs. Mire was concerned primarily with an assessment of labor education needs and how to meet them. He based his analysis on a description of existing programs in the unions, in universities, and in other agencies, private and public.

The present survey differs from past efforts in a number of ways. We have attempted with some success to compile statistics for some kinds of activities. We have tried to distinguish more carefully between institutions whose primary function is labor education and those for whom labor education is incidental. For the first group we have given greater attention to problems of structure and program development. We have analyzed in more detail certain key programs like the one-week resident schools and the efforts at staff training. We have included the educational activities of the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, usually omitted from labor education studies. Our study is most different, however, because it is current, and because the changes that have taken place in the field since 1956 are important enough to warrant new information. The only recent attempts to describe what is going on are to be found in brief articles: a symposium in the journal, Industrial Relations, 12/ and papers presented at a 1965 conference at Oxford. 13/

We are providing a brief history of labor education in the United States to help newcomers to the field understand the present. Since unions as institutions are so important in this connection, we have also included a few pages on the structure of the American union movement. The section on trade union structure follows immediately; then the history.

Union Structure in the United States

To understand the development of the present structure of labor education in this country it is important to remember that since the beginnings of permanent American unionism it has been the national union that has played the key role in accomplishing the basic purposes of unionism: to organize workers and to improve their conditions of life and work through collective bargaining with employers. (The term "international union" is applied to those U.S. unions which have membership in Canada or, in one case, Panama. In this survey we will consistently use "national union" for ease in reference, and hope to be forgiven by those unionists who are proud of their international character.)

National unions are made up of locals to which the individual members belong. In many instances locals are grouped together for administrative, bargaining, or constitutional purposes into an intermediate organization. These subgroups are known by different names in different unions (for example, joint boards, districts, departments, councils, conferences) and their functions vary from union to union.

In 1965 the U.S. Department of Labor reported 189 national unions in this country. One hundred twenty-nine of these unions were affiliated with the American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations. They represented 85 percent of the approximately 16 million union members in the United States at that time. (Since the publication of the Department of Labor Report some of the unions have merged, and during the course of this survey the AFL-CIO has expelled its largest affiliate, the United Auto Workers.)

The AFL-CIO is a federation of national unions, each of which pays seven cents per member per month to support the work of the federation. The AFL-CIO does assist its members in organizing and--more rarely--in bargaining; and it does have the machinery to iron out disputes between unions. Most of its activity, however, is in legislation, political action, international labor affairs, and other areas that cut across union lines.

The national unions determine federation policy through their representation at AFL-CIO conventions. But they are not bound by AFL-CIO policy in such areas as legislation and politics. Strong unions conduct their own legislative and political activity and on some issues may disagree with AFL-CIO policy. Expulsion is the only penalty the federation imposes on a member union that "misbehaves." Cooperation in federation projects is achieved by reason, not sanction.

National unions within the AFL-CIO may join in groups called trade departments, for certain common purposes. Examples are the Industrial Union Department, the Building and Construction Trades Department, and the Metal Trades Department. The departments are financed by the respective member unions and function variously in accordance with the desires of the group.

The AFL-CIO charters state and local central bodies. Locals of national unions may affiliate with the central bodies in a geographic area by paying per capita dues. In a few instances a union constitution may require local union affiliation with a central body, but the AFL-CIO constitution contains no such requirement. The state and local central bodies work chiefly on legislative, political, and community problems. Some AFL-CIO trade departments also charter councils composed of locals of their affiliated unions. Examples are the local Building Trades Councils and the Metal Trades Councils.

The union members maintain contact with the union movement through the national union via the locals. The local union operates under the constitution of the national union. Most of the dues paid by members is used by national unions and the locals and other subordinate bodies. Most union paid staff is employed by national unions or their subordinate units. Strikes are called and contracts negotiated within the national union structure.

National unions vary in the amount of autonomy of their locals and intermediate organizations. In general, this reflects the bargaining patterns, the greatest autonomy operating in those unions in which local bargaining is most important. In the unions having greater local authority in bargaining, there tends to be greater local initiative in other matters, including education.

U.S. Labor Education History

To understand U.S. labor education today it is helpful to know its history. Since a key aspect of labor education is its relation to unionism, the following summary describes the developments in the field in relation to the state of unionism during the various periods. 14/

In most Western industrialized countries, programs for the education of workers as workers were developed along with, and supported by, other workers' institutions: unions, political parties, and cooperatives. These institutions had as a primary purpose the reform of society and they saw education as one means to this end as well as a way of training workers to take responsibility within their own organizations and in the society.

This was not the case in the United States. The dominant trade union federation prior to the first world war, the American Federation of Labor, developed outside of the movement for major social reform and consciously kept itself apartment from that movement. It feared that involvement in social reform would weaken the unions' purpose: increased immediate benefits for workers through collective bargaining with employers. The national unions, however, were the important element in the AFL, each union autonomous in its own jurisdiction, and some of these opposed AFL policies on this issue. The opposition came chiefly from Socialist unionists, who disagreed with and opposed some AFL policies.

Within the unions it was primarily the Socialists who stressed the importance of education for workers and who saw this education--as did the Europeans--as providing a broader understanding of society and the workers' role in changing that society, and as an opportunity to the individual worker for cultural advancement. Support for workers' education came from two other groups, both outside the unions. There were some prominent educators who felt that opportunities for workers were important in any system of education. They felt that such education was essential if workers were to play a significant role in society. The other group that supported workers' education were individuals, many of them women, concerned with social problems, in general sympathetic to the goals of both unionism and social reform. This latter group contributed financial support as well.

Thus there was a difference in purpose between the advocates of workers' education in the United States and the leaders of the official trade union movement. The leaders of the majority of the unions felt that experience was the best teacher for the day-to-day trade union tasks, and that classes for workers might well become an avenue for the support of policies contrary to those favored by the AFL.

In addition, among some unionists there was the faith that the American school system, more broadly based and more open than the schools in Europe, would give workers an education that would enable them to function effectively in society. This had been one of the objectives of the unions when they supported the expansion of free public education.

The labor education that grew up in the formative period of American unionism before the first world war developed outside the official union movement, therefore, and in many cases was supported by the opponents of AFL official policy. It was primarily in those unions under Socialist influence that education was regarded as a union function; and this tended to be a broad education, only in small part related directly to day-to-day trade union activity.

The first classes set up for workers as unionists were probably those conducted by the Women's Trade Union League, which had been established in 1903 by women trade unionists supported by women from other sectors of the society who were concerned with the working conditions of their sex. In 1913 the Women's Trade Union League began a special training program for women unionists.

The first union education department was established by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in 1916. This was followed by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in 1919. Before that time both of these unions, whose membership was heavily concentrated in New York City, had participated in the educational programs of the Rand School of Social Science which had been founded in 1906 by Socialists. Educational activity conducted by these unions continued to emphasize general social problems and individual cultural advancement.

The American Federation of Labor grew rapidly during World War I. Forces such as the Socialist Party, which had challenged AFL official policy, were rendered ineffective because of their opposition to the war, while the AFL enjoyed a close relationship with and support from the Wilson administration. As a result of this growth and the general reform atmosphere arising at the time, there was a spirit of militancy among workers that was reflected in major organizing campaigns, in the formation of a large number of local labor parties, and in the AFL adoption of a "Reconstruction Program" at its 1919 convention, dealing with a wide variety of social problems.

A rapid spread of labor education was one outgrowth of this development. In some areas it took the form of local "labor colleges" sponsored by central labor unions, using mostly sympathetic faculty from nearby colleges and universities as the teachers. The classes were usually held in the evening and were concerned primarily with increasing the social consciousness of the workers rather than training in the skills of unionism. It has been estimated that by 1922 there were 75 such programs in operation. It was in 1920 that the University of California at Berkeley established the first university labor extension program. This was done in cooperation with the state federation of labor.

The local efforts attracted a large number of persons not directly involved in unionism who were concerned with social problems and in particular the well-being of workers. Support from such people and from unionists led to the founding in 1921 of Brookwood, in Westchester County, New York, as the first permanent resident labor school in the United States. Brookwood offered a two-year program combining broad general education with training for union activity. In the same year Bryn Mawr, a women's college in the suburbs of Philadelphia, experimented with an eight-week summer session for 100 women workers, setting a pattern which was to be followed in later years by other colleges and universities throughout the country. While Brookwood and the women's summer schools were set up independently of the official labor movement, they drew support from many national unions, central bodies and individual unionists.

In 1921 also the Workers' Education Bureau was founded. The WEB was an effort by labor education activists to create for labor education a national coordinating organization which would, among other functions, relate to the AFL. While AFL leaders had held aloof from the individual labor education projects, president Samuel Gompers did approve of the WEB and designated the AFL standing committee on education, made up of conservative unionists, as the liaison between the federation and the new organization. Some indication of the general approach of the new organization's founders as it related to the AFL was given by the election as WEB president of James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor and a well-known socialist, who differed sharply with the official position of the AFL on many issues. Maurer contended that "the underlying purpose of workers' education is the desire for a better social order." 15/

The early rapid expansion of labor education took place during a period in which unions seemed to be spreading their influence. But this proved to be a false hope. Employers used the post World War I depression as a signal to attack unions, destroying them wherever possible. A drive for the open shop spread through the country, with state and federal government generally supporting the employers' anti-union efforts. Thus the 1920's was a period of decline for American unions. Before the 1929 depression unionism had lost most of its effectiveness outside certain local market industries. Even a union that had been as strong as the United Mine Workers was unable to maintain organization in much of the soft-coal industry. Beginning in 1929, the depression and widespread unemployment was accompanied by further declines in union membership. While there was no destruction of unionism as an institution in the areas where it had been strong, the mass-production industries continued to be strongholds of anti-unionism.

During most of this period of trade union decline labor education grew. Some of the local labor colleges were discontinued as the unions lost strength. But others persevered, and there was an increase in the number of independent labor education agencies, particularly resident schools. Other colleges joined Bryn Mawr in sponsoring summer schools for women workers. Such a school at the University of Wisconsin became coeducational at the request of the state federation of labor, and since 1925 there has been a labor education center at that university. The moving spirit in the Bryn Mawr women's summer school established a year-round institution, Vineyard Shore, in upstate New York. A new resident school, Commonwealth, was set up in 1923 in Arkansas. Brookwood continued, shifting from a two-year program to one year. The University of California labor extension activity was maintained, and the National University Extension Association, in 1923, endorsed cooperation in labor programs and set up a committee on workers' education.

One result of the union decline that began in the 1920's was a sharp challenge to the official policies of the American Federation of Labor as they related to craft versus industrial unionism, initiative in organizing, and attitudes toward politics and social policy. Unions representing nearly a third of the AFL membership questioned these policies at conventions, and within almost every union there was difference of opinion. It was inevitable that workers' education classes would involve issues that were in controversy within the AFL, particularly since many of the unionists active in labor education opposed the AFL policies and since the AFL involvement in labor education had come only reluctantly.

Always sensitive to possible opposition, the AFL leadership made certain, first, that the Workers' Education Bureau remained under control, and eventually it took over the Bureau's major financing. 16/ By 1929 the Workers' Education Bureau had in effect become the educational arm of the American Federation of Labor, although it was not formally reorganized as the AFL education department until 1954. AFL control of WEB policy meant that the Bureau never did become the central coordinating force in labor education that its founders had hoped; rather it became the official AFL spokesman, its activities carefully scrutinized and its publications censored. 17/

In their relations with the WEB the AFL leaders reflected their general suspicion of labor education as it was then being conducted. This suspicion turned to opposition to some major labor education efforts when the AFL convention in 1928 approved of an AFL Executive Council attack on Brookwood as a radical institution. The Council urged that all AFL affiliates withdraw their support from the school. This was a cause célèbre in its time; but perhaps more significant than the attempted blacklisting was the number of AFL-affiliated unions that continued to support the school and send students to it. Some unions did withdraw support; but it was not the unions but concerned individuals who had been the prime source of funds for Brookwood, for the women's summer schools, for Commonwealth, and later for the Highlander Folk School established in the early 1930's as a resident union training center in the south.

The depression had a greater impact on the future of these independent organizations than did the disapproval of the AFL. It was then that financial support began to dry up. Most of the schools were able to weather the depression, often with great difficulty; many were not able to establish a solid base in order to continue into the late 1930's and 1940's. Brookwood continued until 1937. The number of independent summer schools declined, and at the end only Bryn Mawr remained. In 1939 this school left the college campus to go to the former site of the Vineyard Shore school as the Hudson Shore Labor School. The coordinating organization of the summer schools, the Affiliated Schools for Workers, continued through this period, becoming a program operating agency and changing its name to the American Labor Education Service.

The election of Roosevelt and the governmental policies of the New Deal signaled a period of union growth that continued with some ups and downs through the end of the Korean War. Differences in organizing policy did lead to division within the movement and to the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1936. But it was the organization of workers rather than debate over policy that occupied the unionists. Major mass-production industries such as steel, automobiles, and rubber were unionized for the first time, and unionism spread into the areas where it had existed before the depression.

The experiences of the depression also led to a change in the AFL attitude toward social reform. The Federation became a strong supporter of the major social legislation of the New Deal and continued to press for governmental action to deal with social problems. The CIO started out with this perspective.

By the end of the second world war collective bargaining was firmly established in the major sectors of private industry employing blue-collar workers. When the AFL and the CIO merged in 1955, about 16 million unionists represented just under a third of the country's non-farm employment, and with some variation the proportion has remained about the same since.

The rapid growth of unions in the late 1930's created a need for training in the practical aspects of day-to-day union work. This was particularly true in the newly organized mass-production unions, which depended on volunteer activists for local officers and for bargaining in the plant. Unions like those in the garment industries, which had supported labor education in the past, expanded their programs and shifted from broad social education to the training of the thousands of new local union leaders. Education was accepted as a union function in the new unions. The UAW recognized education as an important activity at its founding convention in 1936. Labor education became training for trade-union service, and much more of it was carried on by the unions themselves.

Stronger unions had more money as well as greater needs. This made it possible for them to expand their activity and it related them to the independent workers' education agencies in a different way. The unions wanted more direct help for immediate problems and those independent agencies that continued through this period changed their format to accommodate to this need. The summer school of the University of Wisconsin School for Workers became a series of one-week schools sponsored by individual unions. When Bryn Mawr became Hudson Shore the general summer school became shorter and special programs for individual unions became more important. And so it was with the American Labor Education Service and the Southern School for Workers. When the Rosenwald Foundation financed the Georgia Workers' Education Service in the period immediately following the second world war, the program was concerned primarily with urgent trade-union problems.

It should be noted, however, that the independent labor education organizations always maintained an interest in broader social issues such as civil rights or international affairs, and they provided leadership for education in many areas of social concern. They also were the source of experimentation in teaching method and materials.

During the early New Deal the federal government, for the first time, became a supporter of workers' education. Workers' education was a separate unit in the adult education programs financed by federal emergency relief funds. Between 1933 and 1943 the WPA workers' education program reached one million workers in 36 states, which included most of those in which unionism was growing. Unemployed teachers taught the classes; the students came mostly from unions and organizations of the unemployed; the subjects ranged from literacy to the creative arts and included a high proportion directly related to effective unionism. Many of the administrators came to the program with previous experience in labor education at resident workers' schools. Advisory committees made up of trade unionists and educators related the program to the labor organizations.

Immediately after the second world war the growing strength of the unions and the experiences with the WPA workers' education program created an interest in establishing permanent government support for labor education similar to that provided for farmers through agricultural extension. The wave of postwar strikes focused attention on the problems of collective bargaining, leading some students of unionism and some legislators to feel that education might improve the possibilities for industrial peace. Between 1944 and 1947 the governmental responsibility was met by a small special program in the Department of Labor, chiefly for classes in contract administration. As we shall see later, university programs received impetus from these same ideas.

There were four major developments in labor education in the period immediately following World War II. Unions expanded their activities; universities, particularly those that were state-supported, began to play a major role; Catholic labor education grew; and the independent agencies almost disappeared.

Union programs grew in the number of national unions involved, in the size of the individual programs, and in the sophistication applied to the subjects. But those national unions that supported education were still a minority. Both national labor federations expanded their educational activity: the CIO, by conducting programs directly; the AFL, by encouraging labor education and assisting unions and central bodies. But the work of the federations remained limited compared with that of the national unions. Any major national union educational program would reach more workers and offer greater variety than that of the federation to which it belonged.

As has been indicated earlier, two state universities, California and Wisconsin, had established formal labor education programs even before the New Deal era. But only Wisconsin continued through the New Deal and the war. The post World War II interest in university labor education was a reflection of three elements: the growing strength of unionism; the belief among some educators and many unionists that the government should be responsible for educational service to workers like that provided by the universities to other functional groups; and, finally, the feeling that university educational programs might contribute to industrial peace. Whatever the motivation, an increasing number of universities began to provide a labor education service, usually but not always in conjunction with an industrial relations center. This movement began in the postwar period and has continued since.

In general, unions with their own programs welcomed the expansion of educational activity once a procedure for consultation and cooperation between unions and universities had been established. The consultative machinery also assuaged the fears of those unionists who felt that universities could not be trusted because they were controlled by reactionary business elements or that university faculty tended to be unrealistic about unionism.

The fears of business control were aggravated in 1948 when an attack by the auto industry forced the ending of an experimental workers' education program at the University of Michigan. That attack was part of a successful effort to prevent the passage of a bill to provide federal grants for university labor education. But the Michigan example was not followed in other states. The number of university programs continued to grow, and less than ten years after its early program had been stopped the University of Michigan began a new one. Nor did Michigan State University give up its program when, in 1961, there was a legislative attack. The statement by MSU president John A. Hannah to the legislative investigating committee has become a classic rationale in support of public university labor education. 18/

There had always been some labor education programs conducted by socially-minded Catholic priests following the concepts set forth in the papal encyclicals on social problems. The Catholic programs expanded rapidly in the mid-1940's and were soon operating in most major cities, providing a combination of trade-union training and ideological education. In part the latter was an effort to counteract the influence of Communist unionists. Particularly where unions were not conducting their own classes, the Catholic schools filled the vacuum left by the termination of the WPA. Catholic labor education continued on a large scale into the early 1950's and then began to decline.

While the university programs and those of the unions were growing, the postwar period saw the demise of the independent labor education agency. The independent organizations were unable to establish a financial base in the unions, among interested individuals, or in the foundations that would enable them to continue. When the Rosenwald funds were exhausted, the Georgia Workers' Education Service had to terminate. Highlander shifted from labor education to civil rights, partly because of disagreements over union policy. The American Labor Education Service was the last of the independent agencies to liquidate. Its final programs were financed chiefly by grants from the Fund for Adult Education. What few foundation grants have been available for labor education have gone primarily to the university centers.

Since the merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1955, shifts in employment patterns have had their impact on the unions. There is now a declining proportion of total employment in the fields where unions have traditionally been strong, while there has been a sharp growth in white-collar employment generally, in the service industries and in state and local government. For most of the period since 1955, union membership remained fairly stable. In the past few years there has been an upsurge in membership, particularly among government employees--federal, state, and local--and in the service industries. This trend includes a large number of white-collar workers who had hitherto shown little interest in unionism. There has also been some interest among the lowest-paid groups: agricultural workers and nonprofessional employees in hospitals and similar institutions.

Many of the rapidly growing unions of government employees have established education departments, reflecting a desire to meet the need of educating local activists like the need of mass-production unions in the early New Deal. In addition, some unions that had been hostile in the past to labor education began to develop activity. They paid increasing attention to staff training, including some unions without education programs for the local officers and other activists. In part this reflected a generational turn-over among union leaders; in part, the increasing complexity of union work.

At the same time the number of university labor education centers increased and these now exist in almost every major industrial state. Both in unions and universities there has been an increase in education programs on general social problems, reflecting the increasing involvement of the unions in legislative and political activity. Technical education for unionism has become broader and more sophisticated in an effort to develop expertise.

At present, therefore, it can be said that U.S. labor education is organized in two forms: within the unions and in the universities. The result is fragmented institutionalization. 19/ The primary union programs are those of the national unions, each set up in accordance with its own priorities. Within the universities there is the same individual initiative.

In summary, one might say that there have been three major periods in the development of U.S. labor education. Prior to the New Deal, labor education programs focused on social reconstruction and individual development and were conducted mainly by independent agencies financially supported largely by concerned individuals. The American Federation of Labor had no concept of education as a union function and it was suspicious of and often opposed to the activities that were taking place. Many unions did, however, support these activities, especially those unions opposed to official AFL policies.

From the New Deal through World War II the demands of a rapidly growing labor movement changed the emphasis from social reconstruction to practical trade union training. An increasing number of unions developed their own programs; those with a traditional interest in education were joined by the new unions in the mass-production industries, and there was support for education by both the AFL and the CIO. Yet no union program emerged that was directed toward the total movement. For ten years there was a major federal workers' education program supported by relief funds; it was probably the most widespread labor education the country has known. Independent workers' education agencies that functioned through this period changed the character of their activities to accommodate them better to the needs of the unions. But the number of these groups began to decline, essentially for lack of funds.

Since the second world war, union programs have continued to grow and support for education has spread to unions that were formerly opposed to labor education or suspicious of it. Nevertheless, there are still more unions without education programs than with them.

For a time there was a spurt in the amount of education for unionists conducted under Catholic auspices, but it was short-lived. A major growth has taken place in the number of university-sponsored labor education centers, and these now exist in nearly every major industrial state. Consultative machinery between the university programs and the unions has been developed which establishes a base for cooperation.

The postwar period also has seen the closing down of the last of the independent workers' education agencies that had their origins in the 1920's.

Footnotes

1/ Jack London, Robert Wenkert, and Warren O. Hagstrom, Adult Education and Social Class (Berkeley, University of California Survey Research Center, 1963), pp. 191-204.

2/ London et al., op. cit., p. 41; John W. C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, Volunteers for Learning (Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 75-76.

3/ Marius Hansome, World Workers' Education Movements (New York, Columbia University Press, 1931).

4/ T. A. Adams, The Workers' Road to Learning (New York, American Association for Adult Education, 1940).

5/ Workers' Education in the United States, Theodore Brameld, ed. (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1941).

6/ Bert MacLeach, Workers' Education in the United States. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951.

7/ Mark Starr, "Union Education Survey," Labor and Nation (Fall 1951).

8/ Caroline F. Ware, Labor Education in Universities (New York, American Labor Education Service, 1946).

9/ Irvine L. H. Kerrison, Workers' Education at the University Level (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1951).

Chapter II Footnotes (cont'd)

10/ Jack Barbash, *Universities and Unions in Workers' Education* (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1955).

11/ Joseph Mire, *Labor Education* (Madison, Inter-University Labor Education Committee, 1956).

12/ "Symposium on Labor Education," *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (February 1966), includes the following articles on the United States: Lois Gray, "The American Way in Labor Education," pp. 53-66; Brandan Sexton, "Staff and Officer Training to Build Successful Unions," pp. 83-96; Herbert A. Levine, "Will Labor Educators Meet Today's Challenges?" pp. 97-106.

13/ *Workers Education*, University of Oxford Delegacy for Extra-Mural Studies (Oxford, 1965), includes the following articles on the United States: Lawrence Rogin, "AFL-CIO and Union Schemes for Workers' Education in the U.S.A.," pp. 5-10; F. K. Hoehler, Jr., "University Schemes for Education and Training of Union Representatives," pp. 11-18; Jack London, "Adult and Workers' Education in the U.S.A.," pp. 23-34.

14/ In the preparation of this brief history we have drawn liberally from two publications: Alice H. Cook and Agnes Douty, *Labor Education Outside the Unions* (Ithaca, N.Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1958), pp. 77-90; and Lois Gray, *op. cit.*

15/ Marius Hansome, "The Development of Workers' Education," in *Workers' Education in the United States*, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

16/ MacLeach, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

17/ James Morris, *Conflict Within the AFL* (Ithaca, Cornell University, 1958), fn. pp. 89-90.

18/ John A. Hannah, "The 'People's Colleges,'" *The American Federationist*, Vol. 68, No. 11 (November 1961), pp. 29-31.

19/ Lawrence Rogin, "How Far Have We Come in Labor Education?" in *The Labor Movement, A Re-examination* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Industrial Relations Research Institute, 1967), pp. 121-26, provides an impressionistic view of the impact of institutionalization.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

To present an account of the current state of labor education it was necessary to (1) identify the institutions engaged in the field; (2) in so far as possible, obtain statistical information about their activities, i.e. the various kinds of programs and the enrollment in each; and (3) interview the directors of the major programs about their respective activities and about labor education generally.

In labor education there are two major institutions: the national unions, and the university centers. A review of the reports issued by these two groups indicated that while they would be helpful they were not detailed enough to provide the required information. The university reports are more comprehensive but they vary greatly in what is included and in the dates of the reporting period. Variations in the national union reports are even greater, most of them being general and lacking specific information; in some cases they are so brief as to give only the flavor of the educational program. Union reports are usually prepared for the union conventions and therefore cover different periods of time.

What is true of national union reports is even more marked in the reports of the national AFL-CIO and the state and local central bodies.

It was necessary, therefore, to design a questionnaire to go to the directors of the various programs to obtain the necessary statistical information for our survey. Because of the differing nature of their programs, separate questionnaires had to be designed for the university labor education centers and for the unions; and, within that group, separate questionnaires for the national unions, for the state central bodies, and for the local central bodies.

The project staff in cooperation with a technical consultant prepared drafts of questionnaires for national unions and for the university labor education centers. The drafts were reviewed at a two-day meeting with seven union education directors and four directors of university centers, all representing major programs. At this meeting we set the period for which we would gather statistics from national unions and university centers: January 1, 1965, to December 31, 1966. Any period selected would have meant difficulties for many of the respondents to the questionnaire. The calendar year was chosen because normally there is a break in program during the year-end holidays, while there is no such break in programs operating through the late spring, summer, and early fall. The two-year period was selected at the insistence of those at the meeting. It was argued that the normal ups and downs of a program would average out over two years and that the most recent year, 1966, would not be typical because of the union involvement in the hard-fought congressional elections which affected labor education activity.

It was unrealistic to try to get statistics for a two-year period from institutions less committed to labor education or having smaller staff. Consultation with representatives of local and state central bodies and the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, and with others we approached for information, indicated that it would be hard enough to get information covering one year, and practically impossible for two. The experiences of the survey proved them right. For institutions other than national unions and university centers, therefore, we sought information on activity during the 1966 calendar year only.

Before they were sent out, the national union and the university questionnaires were revised in accordance with the suggestions made at the two-day meeting and reviewed by representatives of the participants and by the project's technical consultant. Copies of the final questionnaires will be found in Appendices V and VI.

The university questionnaire was sent to each director of the twenty-five university labor education centers in operation on December 31, 1966. Responses were received from all but one, the University of Puerto Rico. Efforts to obtain a completed questionnaire from this center were complicated by staff changes, and since it proved impossible to get statistical information on this program we excluded it from the report. The omission is unfortunate because the Puerto Rican program operates somewhat differently from the others.

Three new university labor education centers were established in 1967 and 1968, while we were making this survey. The experiences of these centers are included in the general discussion of university programs, but no statistics on their activities are included. The list of university labor education centers will be found in Appendix I.

We also sent the university questionnaire to two other institutions which conduct labor education activity similar to the university programs: the Labor Education Program, Division of School Extension of the School District of Philadelphia; and the Workers' Education Program, Trade and Industrial Education Service, Alabama State Department of Education. Statistics from these institutions are included in the university tabulations.

National union questionnaires were sent out to the 128 affiliates of the AFL-CIO and to 20 nonaffiliated national unions, the names of the latter being obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor Directory of National and International Unions in the United States, 1965 (Bulletin No. 1493). Since most of the national unions have no full-time staff working exclusively on education, it was expected that the returns would be slow and this proved to be the case. For AFL-CIO affiliates, the Department of Education sent out a follow-up letter enclosing a second copy of the union questionnaire. Telephone calls were made to all national unions known to have education programs. Completed questionnaires were finally received from 48 national unions, 44 of them affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The list of unions returning completed questionnaires will be found in Appendix I. One questionnaire returned by a nonaffiliated union is not included in the tabulations because the answers clearly did not respond to the questions.

The national unions that responded to questionnaires had a membership of 10,577,000 in 1965, of the total national union membership of 17,900,000 that year reported by the Department of Labor bulletin mentioned above. The respondents do include every national union known to be conducting an education program of any size during 1965 and 1966. There were 19 national unions with a membership of 100,000 or more that did not respond, including a number of major AFL-CIO affiliates and the major unaffiliated unions. None of these has an education program currently, although four have had programs in the past. None of the smaller unions that did not respond is known to have had active continuing education programs during the survey period. The response to the questionnaire, therefore, does provide the information needed to describe the educational activity of national unions in the United States. Forty-three of the 48 responding unions reported some educational activity.

From the planning meeting mentioned earlier, and from the experience of the survey staff, we were aware of the general weakness of statistics on union educational activity, and our expectations were realized. Most of the responding national unions did have approximate figures on educational activity conducted by the headquarters staff. Even these records, however, are incomplete, as was indicated in several instances when union staff changes required a new education director to report on programs conducted prior to his assumption of office. Very few national unions have reports of programs conducted by their regional education staff on the national union payroll. And, to the best of our knowledge, no national union keeps any accurate record of educational activity conducted by its local unions or other subordinate organizations. This is true even of unions as active in education as the UAW and the ILGWU.

One result of our survey was that two national unions did seek information on the work of their regional education staff for inclusion in their reports. That it is possible to get such information is indicated by the experience of the Communications Workers of America, which does have complete records for all educational activity conducted by anyone on the national union payroll.

It was even more difficult to get accurate information from those unions in which educational programs are conducted apart from the education department. The UAW is a case in point. A large number of the UAW servicing departments train officers and stewards, particularly in contract interpretation and enforcement. Specialized departments like Community Services, the Older and Retired Workers Department, and the Women's Department also carry on a variety of educational activity. All of this work is generally described in the reports to the convention but without any statistics. Nor were figures available when we sought them.

Differences in union structure also affected the gathering of information. Programs that might be conducted by a national education department in a centralized union would likely be conducted locally if a union were decentralized. In one case the information would be available to us; in the other case it would not.

It was clear from the beginning that we would be unable to get a complete account of educational activities conducted by local unions and other subordinate bodies of national unions. We did, however, want to provide some idea of such programs, particularly since some of the most imaginative work in labor education is done by locals of national unions without a central program. We therefore prepared a questionnaire that was sent out to a small number (46) of locals that we knew had programs or whose identity was provided to us by education directors or other responsible officials of national unions. A copy of this questionnaire will be found in Appendix VII. The response from the locals was comparatively small (20) and does not include some known to be active in education. However, one union, the International Association of Machinists, did adapt the questionnaire to its own needs and circulated it. The returns from the IAM survey are included in our discussion of local union programs.

Questionnaires were also prepared for state and local central bodies. Before being sent out these questionnaires were reviewed by knowledgeable trade unionists and by our technical consultant. Copies will be found in Appendices VIII and IX. Of the 50 questionnaires sent to state central bodies, 16 were returned after some follow-up by correspondence and telephone calls. A list of AFL-CIO state central bodies responding to our questionnaire is found in Appendix I. It includes most of those known to conduct educational programs.

The AFL-CIO provided a list of the 72 local central labor bodies each with an affiliated membership of 20,000 or more. All of these received our questionnaire but the returns were sparse (15) and unrepresentative. Our section on the educational activity of local central bodies has very little statistical base. However, local central bodies carry on only scant activity except that in cooperation with universities and that described in the section on community services, a major program.

In addition to the questionnaires, detailed interviews were conducted with the directors of the major union and university programs. These interviews provided nonstatistical information about their own programs and information and opinions about labor education in general. To assist in these interviews we drafted a list of questions for the unionists and another for the university directors. The questions were sent out in advance of the interviews, which were conducted informally in depth in an attempt to get thoughtful responses. Some of the information was given confidentially and we have used it accordingly. In most cases the interviews were conducted solely with the program directors; in some instances, at the request of the director, other members of the staff were present. When different persons were in charge of staff training and other education programs within a union, separate interviews were conducted.

We interviewed the directors of all university labor education centers which were operating during our survey period except four: Maine and Missouri, which had no directors or programs during most of the period of our survey; Puerto Rico for reasons indicated earlier; and Hawaii, in which case we did interview a staff member of the center while he was on the mainland. We interviewed each of those in charge of sixteen national union education programs and the director and assistant directors of the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

In the sections of our report dealing with other institutions we have described the methods used for collecting information about them.

To avoid the impression that our figures represent different individuals, we have used the term "enrollments," rather than "students" or "participants," to express the number of those who have participated in labor education activities. This is particularly important because in the two-year period of our survey the enrollments in both national unions and university labor education centers will include many of the same individuals who have been involved in several different programs.

CHAPTER IV

UNION EDUCATION

Only a few of the 189 national unions conduct the major share of the union education programs in the United States. The programs are initiated at headquarters and conducted by the union itself, sometimes in cooperation with a university labor education center, or--less often --with other resources outside the union. Some programs are initiated by the locals and other subordinate organizations of a national union. This occurs usually in unions that sponsor national programs but sometimes also takes place in local organizations of a national union that has no active program.

The national union programs are independent of one another, varying greatly in extent and character. In each case the program is directed to the institutional needs of the union as it sees them. The union provides its active members and sometimes its full-time staff with skills, information, and an understanding of the organization, its problems, and its aims.

Education that crosses national union lines is conducted by some AFL-CIO state central bodies and by a smaller number of local central bodies. Most of the central body programs are concerned with their own institutional needs, but in some instances they attempt to fill the gaps left by national unions that have no educational activity or whose programs do not reach down to the locals.

The national AFL-CIO Department of Education promotes labor education and assists national unions and central bodies with guidance, staff, and materials. The Department also performs a coordinating function among the union educators and between them and the university labor educators. In recent years it has also taken the initiative in certain aspects of inter-union staff training and in experimental programs for young workers. A major union educational program originates in the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services and is carried on primarily through local central bodies. Two other AFL-CIO staff departments, Research and Organization, have been involved in staff training as a minor part of their work.

This chapter will describe the educational activity of the various segments of the union movement, starting with the national unions and their locals and proceeding to the national AFL-CIO and the central bodies. One section is devoted to community services education, and separate sections discuss two other aspects of union education that have special importance: one-week resident schools, and staff training.

National Unions

Most national unions in the United States do not initiate labor education programs for their staff or members. Forty-three of the 48 that responded to our questionnaire indicated varying degrees of activity. A few unions that did not respond are known to conduct limited activity and may have national union staff assigned to education. These are so few, however, that they would not add measurably to our total. There are also a few unions that have begun programs since the end of 1966, particularly in staff training; but, again, these do not change the general picture.

Our questionnaire listed various types of labor education and requested information on whether such activity was part of the union program. The responses to this query are shown in Table IV-1.

Table IV-1

TYPES OF NATIONAL UNION EDUCATION ACTIVITY, 1965 and 1966 1/

Activity	Yes	No
Special training programs for full-time staff	18	25
Educational sessions at staff meetings	15	28
Participation in inter-union staff training	22	21
Resident schools for local unionists	22	21
Education conferences for local unionists	33	10
Education activity at other union conferences	20	23
Part-time classes for local unionists	10	33
Education for retired members	7	36
Pre-retirement education	4	39
Education for families of members	10	33
Departments other than education also conducting education	14	29

1/ Based on returns from 43 national unions reporting labor education activity.

It is clear from the foregoing table that many unions sponsor only a few activities and cannot claim to be seriously involved in education. We would put 17 in this category. Three of these reported only that they encouraged local education; otherwise we might have placed them in the group reporting no activity at all. Two reported an annual one-week resident school for local unionists as their sole activity. Seven held occasional conferences for local unionists; three sponsored one-week schools and occasional conferences; one had a staff-training program biennially; and the last conducted conferences occasionally and did some staff training.

Of the 43 unions, therefore, one could say that only 26 have fairly consistent programs. This correlates closely with the number of national unions (24) reporting staff at national headquarters working full time on education. The 26 active unions include most of the larger ones offering any educational program and represent a 1965 membership of 8,112,000, according to figures in the U.S. Department of Labor Directory, Bulletin 1493. Even within this group of 26 unions there are great variations in goal, method, and extent of activity.

It is important to indicate as clearly as possible why some unions are active in labor education and others are not, and why programs have developed as they have. To assist in this analysis and to provide a background for further discussion of national union education we have prepared program descriptions for 14 national unions, having selected those we regarded as most active or displaying some unique features. Omitted are a number of unions with labor education staff and regular programs for one of the following three reasons: (1) the programs are small and have no special features; (2) formerly well-established programs were changing or declining during 1965 and 1966 and their future direction was not clear; or (3) some programs are just getting under way and are in a formative period which is difficult to describe.

Information for the descriptions was gathered from the questionnaires, from reports, and through interviews. In addition to noting the activities and the special character of the programs we sought to show how education fits into the union structure and philosophy. When information relating to 1967 activities is relevant we have included it. We have placed the program descriptions in the order of size of their union membership as listed in the 1965 Department of Labor Directory mentioned above. The membership is noted on each description. The figures, which are the most recent provided by the Department of Labor, understate the current membership of most unions, particularly that of unions of government employees.

Program Descriptions

International Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America. 1965 membership: 1,168,000

In 1936 the founding convention of the United Auto Workers dedicated a portion of its membership dues to the support of education. This provision in the union constitution indicated an attitude that has prevailed through the years. The UAW now offers the largest and most varied national union education program in the United States. Education is pervasive in the UAW; it is regarded as an activity to help the union function effectively in all its concerns. Because, from the beginning, the union has promoted broad social programs, the courses include social issues and the role of unionism in society as well as the training of trade unionists in their day-to-day activity.

The UAW constitution provides both local and national education funds by allocating from the dues two cents per member per month for each local union fund, and three cents per member per month for the national fund. Thus there is both local and national initiative for education. The need for education is an idea so widely accepted that many local unions and the national union supplement the allocated funds. In the national union the addition takes the form of support for educational activity in departments other than the education department and the Leadership Studies Center, which is responsible for staff training. Twelve headquarters departments are listed as conducting education programs, in addition to the two having education as their primary concern. Included are servicing departments, which administer contracts, and a large number with special interests such as fair practices, women workers, older and retired workers, and community services. Some of this work might be done by education departments in other unions, but much of it has little parallel elsewhere.

The size of the education department (10 full-time staff members at headquarters and 23 full-time and four half-time regional education representatives in the field) permits the union to experiment in non-traditional labor education areas. In addition, the three full-time staff members and the two two-thirds-time consultants of the Leadership Studies Center comprise the only group of labor educators in the United States who concentrate exclusively on the problems of staff training.

The Leadership Studies Center was established in 1963, charged with the responsibility of providing all UAW staff with training that would relate functionally to their union responsibilities while at the same time broaden their understanding of important social issues. The major program to date has been a series of three-week sessions for the union's servicing staff, almost all of whom have now participated. There has been considerable experimentation in teaching materials and methods. A more complete description of the work of the Center will be found in the section on staff training in this report.

No records are kept of the total amount of education for membership available within the union. It is estimated that about 125,000 UAW members a year engage in some form of educational activity. This would include local classes and conferences on various subjects for stewards and officers; possibly area conferences on collective bargaining or social, legislative, or political questions; the large, one-week resident school program; programs dealing with the problems of women or minorities; classes in preparation for retirement or activity centers for retired workers; classes for new members; a small home study program; and a wide variety of other activities that have an educational purpose and format. The programs would not, however, include the many workers at Ford and elsewhere who attended special classes set up during the 1967 strikes as "strike information-participation sessions." These members were able to fulfill their responsibilities for strike pay by attending weekly classes that were conducted by union representatives and based on material supplied by the education department.

The one-week resident school for local leadership is a key program of the education department. During the period of our survey there were 44 such schools, enrolling 6,195. Most of the schools are held in the summer and are organized around a Core Program which sets an over-all theme. Most of the teaching is done by the UAW education and servicing staff with the help of detailed materials prepared by the education department. Films are used extensively as a ground for discussion. An effort is made to avoid repeating students. In five regions, special one-week schools for local officers were intended to help broaden their understanding of social problems.

To help accelerate the training of leaders for newly organized local unions the education department in 1966 prepared a special discussion guide and trained some 65 UAW local leaders to use it. In some instances the discussion leaders were trained at university labor education centers. By the spring of 1968, 423 such courses had been given, six sessions each. A special discussion guide has been prepared for technical-office and professional locals, as distinguished from those in manufacturing.

The summer schools and the program for new local unions indicates the UAW emphasis on the use of lay teachers supported by detailed materials. The preparation of these materials is a major function of the education department. In addition to the summer school materials, about a dozen course-discussion guides are prepared each year. Generally they include materials for the student as well as those for the discussion leader, and they encourage the use of a variety of discussion techniques. Many of the sessions are organized around films, some especially prepared and others adapted for the course. Each year some new films are produced and some adapted for specific programs. The department also prepares a large number of guides for short presentations on specific subjects, particularly in the area of social policy. These guides are for use in conferences or at local meetings. There are pamphlets and kits to fit special needs such as the responsibilities of officers or orientation for new members. Often the UAW education department assists other union departments by preparing materials for their programs.

The outlines, kits, pamphlets, and films furnished by the education department also help the large number of UAW servicing staff to carry on their educational work. It is estimated that about 200 union staff do some teaching. In the fairly sophisticated areas of social policy, the education department materials may be the only resource for a busy staff representative. Sometimes this leads to an oversimplified presentation, lacking the depth essential for an education experience. This is particularly true when the material presented contains too much for the time allotted.

Unlike those in other unions, the UAW local education committees start out with a function. They have the local fund as a resource. It is estimated that of the approximately 1,450 local unions about 300 committees in the larger locals are active. In twelve locals the education chairman works full time. The education department materials mentioned above and the guidance of the regional education representative are a help to those who want to develop their own programs, and some locals use university labor education centers. There is some training of education committeemen at union schools. Two publications, one general, the other dealing with education programming and resources, are distributed regularly. As indicated earlier, there is no record of local educational activity, but one report from the UAW education department indicates that in the eleven weeks ending March 23, 1965, 97 local union courses or conferences had been held or were definitely planned. Thirty-six of these were for stewards or committeemen, and 21 others provided what was called leadership training. Local union education committees carry on other kinds of programs besides education, the members possibly editing local union newspapers or speaking before public groups and school classes.

While there are no figures that provide a complete picture, it is possible to illustrate some of the educational activity conducted by departments other than education. In 1966 the National Ford Department, in cooperation with the education department, conducted three-day conferences for stewards and committeemen in all Ford locals, concentrating on contract enforcement and including some union history. During 1965 and 1966 the Women's Department held 14 conferences, 11 of them for two or three days each, attended by about 1,200 in all. The Women's Department also held six series of classes for women during the same period with an attendance of 340. In the same two years the Chrysler Department joined with the company in a series of courses to prepare workers and their spouses for retirement. These courses reached 2,990 persons, 1,836 of them Chrysler workers. To conduct the courses, 117 instructors from the union and the company were trained. The program had been negotiated in the Chrysler agreement following successful union courses. For some other programs, the Older and Retired Workers Department has trained discussion leaders throughout the union.

In recent years the UAW education department has increasingly emphasized more traditional educational opportunities for UAW members. In part this arises out of the same pressures that led to the negotiation of tuition refund payments for job-related education. Two new approaches have been developed. In cooperation with the adult education divisions of the school systems in Detroit and neighboring communities, the union has promoted a program of regular elementary and high school adult courses, which are taught in union halls. A primary but not exclusive goal is to assist UAW members in completing high school or in passing the high school equivalency examinations. Since February 1967, when the program started, about 4,500 have registered for classes held in 21 union halls. About two thirds of the registrations were for high school courses.

In the other program the UAW has worked with several community colleges in Michigan to develop an associate degree in labor studies, through a special curriculum to provide an understanding of the role of unionism in society. The first enrollments will be made in the 1968 fall semester. While the union will make a special effort to recruit, the program will be open to all who want to participate.

The 1966 UAW convention mandated the establishment of a series of family education centers. These would provide facilities for education in a family setting, with a full complement of recreational activity. The first of the centers is now being completed on an 800-acre plot at a lakeside in northern Michigan. In its first stage of development it will be able to accommodate nearly 400 persons. It will include a gymnasium with an indoor pool, as well as housing, dining facilities, and classrooms. Additional housing and a children's camp are also planned. About 600,000 UAW members are within one day's drive of the site. Additional centers are expected to be equally accessible to the union's membership in other sections of the country. When they are in operation, these centers will add an entirely new dimension to UAW education.

United Steelworkers of America. 1965 membership: 965,000

Arising out of the period of the New Deal, the United Steelworkers of America is one of the mass-production unions in which education has played a major and continuing role. For about 20 years the union's educational activities were closely integrated with universities, through labor education centers where they existed and with other university departments in the absence of labor education centers. Forming the base of the program were one-week resident schools, planned especially to allow progression for returning students. In some districts the schools were supplemented by conferences and extension classes. On occasion there were special sessions for full-time staff. During this period the union cooperated with the University of Indiana in an experimental, special 13-week resident school for union members, financed in part by a grant from The Ford Foundation.

More recently the union has expanded its national education department, which now employs four staff members, and has initiated its own staff training and developed a series of special conferences for national officers and members of the union's executive board. It is also placing greater emphasis on local union educational activity under the guidance of coordinators in each of the union's districts.

The one-week resident schools, held on a college campus during the summer, continue to be a major part of the program. During the two-year period of our survey, 42 such schools were held, with a total enrollment of 4,700. In most of the schools, those in which the attendance is large enough, four different programs offer different content for first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year students. The first-year program has generally dealt with the steel-unionist on the job; the second, with his role as a citizen of the union and the community; the third, with problems of leadership; and the fourth, with the world of ideas, concentrating on the humanities. Some sessions bring together all the students under a general theme. In 1967, the curriculum underwent some shifting, with a general broadening of subjects in the first three years and the addition of a reading improvement course.

The thirteen-week program in cooperation with the University of Indiana labor education center was in a sense an expansion of the ideas behind the one-week schools. A selected group of 20 unionists took specially developed courses in the social sciences and the humanities, providing them with a broad educational background. Three such programs were conducted, the last of which, in 1967, drew unionists from other regions as well as those from the district that gave birth to the idea. The high cost of the program caused it to be discontinued.

Staff training is conducted at the Clinton S. Golden Center, run by the union education department in Pittsburgh. Starting in 1966, groups of 20 national union staff members have been brought together for three weeks of concentrated practical training in union responsibilities. Emphasis is placed on economics as a background tool. By the spring of 1968, ten such sessions had been held. The program is intended for the union's entire staff, and most of the teaching is done by the headquarters staff.

The special conferences for the national officers and executive board are three-day, off-the-record sessions dealing with general problems of social policy. Presentations by nationally known experts are followed by exchanges between the audience and the expert and by discussion within the group. Three executive board conferences have been held in what is expected to be a continuing program.

District educational coordinators have the responsibility for working with universities in one-week resident schools and for the development of local education. There are 31 coordinators in the United States, nearly all of them union field representatives who devote part time to education.

While emphasis is placed on the development of local union and regional education, no record of the extent of these activities has been kept in the past. In general, the amount of work done relates to the concern of the regional staff and the relationship with university labor education centers. In this respect the regional and local organizations vary greatly.

An effort to survey all educational programs in the union in 1966 yielded an estimate of about 60,000 participants in all activities: resident schools, continuing classes, conferences, and special training sessions.

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

1965 membership: 808,000

The education program of the IAM combines nationally conducted education activities, such as summer schools and special work with industry segments of IAM's membership, with a variety of services designed to aid local groups and staff who are conducting their own programs.

This approach stems from the nature of the IAM, whose members work in a wide variety of industries. While some of the membership bargain nationally, there is much local bargaining, and the structure of the union has evolved to provide considerable local autonomy and decentralization. One of the functions of the education department is to help local groups and staff set up their own programs.

For this purpose the department prepares materials on education techniques, provides teaching outlines on steward and officer training, and offers consulting service and teaching aid to local groups on request. An Education Bulletin is issued six times a year to encourage locals to undertake activities such as classes for new members, political education programs, or work with local schools. The Bulletin contains "how to do it" suggestions and lists pamphlets, films, and other resources.

IAM headquarters education staff is supplemented by regional staff working under the supervision of the field vice presidents. There are two full-time regional persons, and four who work on education as one of several assignments. The statistics in this program description include programs run by national and regional staff but do not include programs set up solely by local or district lodges.

This staff conducts classes and weekend conferences throughout the country, focusing in the main on steward and officer development. Regional and national staff do most of the teaching in these programs, although local business representatives and university personnel take part when appropriate.

During 1965 and 1966 there was a total enrollment of 7,972 in such programs. This total breaks down as follows. There were 67 conferences ranging in length from one to four days and enrolling 5,255. In addition, 114 part-time classes (conducted over several days or weeks) drew 1,943 officers and stewards. Twelve programs were devoted mainly to legislative and political issues and were conducted in conjunction with IAM State Council meetings, enrolling 774.

The IAM also has an extensive summer school program that is nationally administered. During the two-year period of the survey, 25 schools were held, enrolling 1,147. Schools are aimed at developing local lodge leadership but they also help build solidarity and understanding among members from the various industries and areas.

Sixteen of these schools offered basic programs for persons who had not attended before, and nine were advanced. All took place on university campuses, using those with labor education programs when possible. Basic schools draw most of their students from a few surrounding states, but advanced schools draw nationwide enrollment.

Who attends these schools? The breakdown for 1967, a typical year, shows that 40% were lodge officers; 40% were stewards; 9% were members of local lodge committees; 8% were business representatives; and 3% were interested members. In 1967, about 15% of the lodges sent students.

Also during 1967, the IAM Secretary-Treasurer's Department conducted nine conferences for lodge financial officers to instruct them in financial procedures. These conferences, held at union headquarters, ran for four days each and drew 450 participants.

Special programs for industry groups within the union are held from time to time. For several years, selected local union leaders from airline lodges have been trained to conduct steward-training programs, either classes or sessions at steward meetings, in their lodges and districts. This training, usually five days long, is reinforced by materials prepared especially for this industry group and by advice when the trainees actually begin to set up programs.

Special materials and teaching aids have also been developed for government lodges in the IAM to help staff establish programs on Executive Order 10988 and the problems of government workers.

The main staff training done by the IAM is the orientation of new staff. In 1966, the union started a regular series of week-long programs on union policies and headquarters services, with added sessions on practical topics like organizing and labor law. Separate programs are held for new business representatives (elected locally) and for new grand lodge representatives (appointed to the national staff). The two programs held during the survey period had 71 participants, and this is now an annual program under the direction of the headquarters vice president.

Prior to this program, the IAM held several week-long schools on university campuses, similar to summer schools in format, which drew 176 business representatives. Some staff training is also accomplished at educational sessions during some of the regional staff meetings called by the vice presidents.

International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. 1965 membership: 442,000

The histories of union education in the United States have always paid special attention to the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. The first national education director was appointed in 1916, and there has been continuous support of education since that time, the program emphasis varying over the years.

At present there is a small national education department which concentrates on staff training, preparation of materials, general promotion of education, and assistance to locally conducted programs. An education staff of 45 is employed by the subordinate units of the union: locals, joint boards, departments, and regions as they are variously designated. Of these, 20 work full time in education, and the others about half time. As the term is used in the ILGWU, education includes a wide variety of cultural, social, and recreational activity directed to the general membership, as well as classes and conferences for local leaders. Just what programs are conducted is determined in each instance by the specific unit, the amount and character of the activities varying widely.

No national figures are kept of locally sponsored classes but one estimate indicates that perhaps 10,000 local activists take part annually in those that deal with problems of the union and the labor movement, while another 5,000 members are in cultural or hobby courses. In the first group are "how to do it" courses relating to the union and the labor movement, and those dealing with economic, social, and political problems. The union encourages new-member classes, and 43 units conduct such a program, usually a single class taught by the local education director or a staff representative.

National education department assistance is provided for regional conferences and three one-week schools held each year: two by midwestern units and one in the east. The conferences and schools combine sessions on problems of the garment industry and the union movement with discussion of political and social issues. During the two-year period of our survey, 12 one-day conferences enrolled 1,500, and 2,275 attended 18 conferences that ran two or three days. Attendance at the six one-week schools held during the same period amounted to 960.

Staff training has been the primary concern of the education department in recent years. Twice annually a four-week training session is held for newly hired staff, about 15 each time. These individuals are designated for training by the subordinate units of the union for which they work. The classes are conducted at union headquarters and deal with problems of the union and the garment industry plus some general background in trade unionism and social action. Instructors come from the education department and other union resources.

This program for new staff has replaced the ILG Training Institute, which operated from 1950 to 1961 in providing a one-year combination of classroom and field work for young men and women who were selected to work for the union.

The education department also conducts training sessions for the staffs of some of the major joint boards and other subordinate units of the union, both in special sessions and as part of staff meetings. Special attention is paid to contract enforcement to assist in dealing with the complicated piece-rate structure of the industry, but other topics such as labor law and organizing are also dealt with. Some regions do their own staff training, particularly in contract enforcement. During the survey period there were about 700 in staff-training sessions run by the education department. The national department also undertakes special education programs for union staff concerned with such subjects as counseling and working with retirees.

A paperback book service distributes about 12,000 books a year through sales to locals and joint boards for resale to the members.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. 1965 membership: 377,000

In the history of union education in the United States the Amalgamated Clothing Workers is cited as one of the first unions to develop its own programs. Almost since the founding of the union in 1914 the ACWA has conducted educational activities, changing in character and extent with the changing times.

The present program of the national union is carried on by a headquarters staff of three full-time and one part-time member, and by a field staff of six. There are also seven education directors, one part-time, employed by the ACWA joint boards. The following describes the work of the national union.

Traditionally, ACWA has had an interest in governmental action on broad social questions as well as those more directly related to union activity. Education programs reflect this interest and are conducted in close cooperation with the union's legislative and political staffs. At the same time the education department seeks to develop understanding and solidarity among the diverse elements of a union membership that comes from isolated plants in rural United States as well as from large cities, north and south. In each program, therefore, training related to immediate union problems is integrated into a framework that keeps these goals in mind.

The present program of the national union is directed primarily to local union activists, reaching them through one-week resident schools and through conferences lasting one day or more. The education department also promotes classes for new members, distributes paperback books, and does some staff training.

There has been growing emphasis on one-week schools, with the number increasing from five with 330 students in 1966 to 12 with over 660 participants in 1967. Teaching at the schools is almost entirely by ACWA staff, and an effort is made to keep the attendance at 50 or less so that there can be a close contact between students and teacher. An attempt is made to recruit at least two from a local union, so that they can make a greater impact when they return to their home communities. Each one-week school reaches a new group; those who have attended cannot return. Instruction is organized around a central theme: in 1967 this was "The Citizen in a Democratic Society," including some history as well as a consideration of current problems. Discussion groups and workshops encourage student involvement in the learning process.

ACWA educational conferences are generally conducted on a regional basis. In the two years of our survey about 8,000 participated in 107 conferences conducted by the education department, of which a little over 5,000 were in sessions lasting two days or more. Emphasis may be placed on a problem currently before Congress or on a prospective political campaign.

The new-members program developed by the education department suggests a carefully planned orientation class. It is now in use in about 15 percent of the union. Local unionists have been trained to take leadership in these classes.

While there is no independent staff-training program, time has been set aside at regional meetings of national staff and at meetings of joint board staff for that purpose. These are half-day to one-day sessions which have dealt with industry economics, civil rights, and international affairs.

Some time ago the education department started the promotion of paperback books through the union paper, The Advance. About 4,000 of a variety of titles are sold each year as a result of this effort. Books are also sold at conferences and schools, and sometimes in bulk orders to locals and joint boards.

"The Inheritance," a film made in conjunction with the union's 50th anniversary, has been used widely in ACWA education programs as well as generally throughout the field of labor education.

Where local education programs exist, they supplement the national effort by training local union officers and stewards, working with retired members, and doing additional work on legislative and political issues, particularly as they reflect the local community.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

1965 membership: 341,000

The education program of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen is directed toward two primary objectives: the education of active local unionists, officers, stewards, and concerned members; and the training of staff.

The administration of both these programs is centered in the union headquarters in Chicago. The program for local unionists consists of a continuing series of one-day conferences in the home communities of the members, while the staff-training programs are conducted at union headquarters in cooperation with the labor education center of Roosevelt University.

The key to the conference program has been the training of local full-time staff members as instructors. This is done in Chicago in one-week teacher-training sessions whose emphasis is on discussion leadership. About 300 discussion leaders have been trained since the program started in 1955, of whom about half are still active. The trained discussion leaders tend to promote education as well as teach.

The conferences themselves are conducted by the national education department at the request of the local unions, using the national staff supplemented by trained instructors from the local involved and, if necessary, instructors from other locals. A wide variety of possible subject matter is suggested, covering general union skills and problems, the special problems of the industry and union, labor legislation, social and economic problems and developments, and political issues. The local makes the selection. Generally a conference will include one tool subject and one that is broader. There is consistent use of appropriate films and the discussion method. During the two-year period of our survey, 129 conferences were held, involving 4,175 participants. A few of these conferences were two- or three-day meetings.

Since the majority of the union's staff is employed by the locals, staff training is directed toward upgrading the skills of this group. Two or three one-week training sessions are held each year for groups of about 35. They deal with developments in the industry and the union, and with collective bargaining and organizing. There are occasional advanced institutes, some lasting two weeks, that offer more sophisticated subject matter including general social developments and their impact on the union. A special series of one-week schools has been conducted for office secretaries who play a key role in local union administration. There is some training in conjunction with other meetings of local union staff, considerable emphasis being placed on political action.

The education department has prepared a new-member-orientation program for administration by the locals. It is used in about 10 percent of the locals.

The department has its own film library, for its own use, for local unions, and for public distribution of films about the union. A few of the latter have been produced.

In its current programs, the education department is making a special effort to reach the younger members and to train the staff to involve this group in union activity.

Communications Workers of America. 1965 membership: 294,000

In the Communications Workers of America, education activity has always been closely tied to the union's goals and program. The experience of CWA members in the telephone industry, where a great deal of time and money is spent in training, has led them to accept the need for education, so that over the years CWA has developed regular programs for educating both staff and newly elected local union officers and stewards. Moreover, the union sees education as a tool to prepare and motivate local leadership when CWA embarks on a new program. The most recent example of this is the "growth" schools which have been training local union leaders in external organizing techniques so they could organize new members.

CWA's present staff-training program puts the main emphasis on new staff. Since 1961 seven small groups have gone through the six-months-long program. Of this, 12 weeks are spent on a university campus in a program of the social sciences and reading improvement; 6 weeks are spent at union headquarters learning resources and policies; 4 weeks are spent in the field working in an organizing situation. Each new staff member received one week of training in teaching techniques so that he will be prepared to teach in the locals where he is later assigned.

Programs for experienced staff are held occasionally now, although during the 1950's there were regular small-group sessions for all staff, largely on policy and problems. The most recent staff program held by CWA took place in 1967, when the staff, in three different groups, had a week's training with an outside educational group on problem solving, how to motivate others to work in union activities, and organizing priorities in staff work.

The staff-training program helps lay the basis for the total education program of CWA, because field staff do most of the teaching in the locals. Each CWA district has an educational coordinator who spends part of his time setting up over-all educational programs such as resident schools in the district, but the bulk of the actual teaching is done by field representatives, who are expected to hold classes for stewards and officers in the locals for which they are responsible. In any one year, roughly 85 CWA staff members (about half the total and nearly all of those assigned to service locals) do this work.

With organization and responsibility clearly defined in this way, steward and officer training is carried on fairly systematically. This is important to CWA because there is high turn-over in many sections of the telephone industry and most of the contracts do not contain union shop clauses. Alert local stewards and officers are necessary to keep membership high.

In the survey period, 1965 and 1966, a total of 7,000 CWA stewards were trained in 562 programs. Officer training is held every two years, after local union elections. In 1966, these sessions reached 2,700 officers from 242 locals in 265 separate programs. Most of this training is done in one- or two-day conferences. Since there are about 800 locals in CWA, these figures would indicate that not all are reached but a significant number of the larger ones are.

Officers and stewards who have attended these programs are eligible to attend week-long resident schools. CWA usually runs first-year programs for those who have not attended a school previously and second-year programs for those who have been through the first-year curriculum. The 1967 first-year program, which is fairly typical, dealt with labor history, economics, and local union activities. The 1967 second-year program dealt with economics, politics, organizing, and psychology. Most of these schools are held on university campuses, but in some places CWA uses lodges and motels. Union field staff and university staff teach these schools.

In 1965, the first year of our survey period, there were 13 week-long schools, drawing 895. It is up to the districts to decide whether and when to run these schools, but the national union pays room, board, and tuition for the students. In that year 34% of the 800 CWA locals sent students to the schools, and on the whole it was the larger locals which participated. The median size of the locals in CWA is 200 members, but the average size of the local to which 1965 students belonged was just over 1,000 members.

CWA's analysis of 1965 students showed that 41% were officers of their locals, and 81% had had previous CWA training (presumably the local training mentioned previously). Average age was 36 years; average length of CWA membership was 11 years. Reflecting the industry, 44% of the students were women.

Taken together the local and summer programs provide CWA with a base of staff experience and local educational acceptance when the union starts a new program. In 1966 CWA set new organizing goals and asked locals to start organizing campaigns in their home communities wherever they could find potential members. That year the week-long schools were devoted to this topic, with sessions on the need for organizing, NLRB procedures, how to survey and sign up people in unorganized plants, and similar subjects. The 21 week-long schools that year reached 507 persons. In order to spread the program, the union is now using local staff in its districts to hold two-day schools on the same organizing topics.

Following-up on this, CWA is preparing to hold short conferences on bargaining and negotiating techniques in the districts, for the leadership ot the newly organized locals.

To add to the longstanding program aimed mainly at local union leadership, CWA would like to see more activity in the locals, to draw in new members, involve young or inactive people. Outlines have been prepared to help local union committees get started--for legislative committees, community services committees, new-members committees, and others. CWA is also experimenting with a "study forum" program aimed to reach members in small groups. Any group of 10 members who agree to organize themselves into a forum can get the materials, which present questions and information for four meetings on consumer problems, titled "Defend Your Dollar."

An education program like that of CWA consumes materials rapidly; field staff must have new and good materials for teaching officers and stewards or the class may lose interest, and the instructors require up-to-date information on all the other topics they may be called upon to teach in summer schools and conferences. As a result CWA prepares and revises numerous teaching outlines and student materials each year, and one of the chief functions of the education director is to plan these materials. Outside assistance is often used to prepare them. The union has also built several education sessions around films and made several educational films for this purpose. This emphasis on fresh education materials gives the staff new information, ideas, and teaching techniques--an important function since there is no refresher training on education skills for them.

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

1965 membership: 234,000

Like other unions of government workers, the AFSCME is in the process of developing an educational program that takes into account the changing changing character of its organization: expansion of collective bargaining and rapid growth.

The national union has thus far turned to education to help two groups within the union--the stewards and the staff. A large number of local unions and the councils, the coordinating intermediate union structure, are using university labor education programs for a variety of training, and some are doing their own education. Following is a description of the education programs of the national union.

The first major effort has been to develop a structure that will provide an opportunity for basic steward training throughout the union. To accomplish this the union has adopted the "line by line" program of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell. This trains local unionists to teach and it was originally used by unions in the paper industry. Working with the union, the Cornell staff has prepared a set of materials that contain the detailed substance of the sessions and specific directives to the instructors. Cornell has also prepared the AFSCME education staff to train the local unionists who will be instructors.

For administrative purposes the education staff is geographically decentralized into three regions so that it can promote and administer the program more effectively throughout the union. In its present phase, the Local Union Training Program, as this effort is known, began functioning in late 1967.

Originally, staff training was conducted on a spot basis to meet immediate problems. During the period of our survey there were 12 three-day educational sessions, with 190 national union and council staff attending. In 1967 there was a special training program for 14 prospective staff members consisting of four weeks of classes and eight weeks of field experience. The class sessions sought to provide a broad understanding of unionism as well as to deal with AFSCME problems. More recently there was an experimental two-week program for existing staff, in cooperation with The American University Labor Studies Center. This program has now been shortened to one week and is continuing on a regular basis.

United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America.

1965 membership: 165,000

The education program of the United Rubber Workers provides training for local union leadership in one-week schools and regional conferences, and includes a yearly series of one-week legislative institutes in Washington, D.C.

The most unusual feature is the legislative institute, which--unlike most union conferences held in Washington--has education, not lobbying, as its purpose and is carefully planned to explain how Congress works and how union political action affects the legislative process. Congressmen and labor experts are invited to give information on key issues, on the legislative process, and on political realities. Then the delegates attend congressional sessions and visit their congressmen to get the flavor first hand. Program and visits are carefully worked out with enough union staff on hand to help unionists interpret what they see and hear. By using Washington as a setting, the institutes bring to life political and legislative issues. Although depth understanding of intricate political issues cannot be gained in one week, the URW finds the institutes very successful in building support for union political action.

In 1965 and 1966, the union conducted six such legislative institutes in Washington, the enrollment of 600 including local union officers, members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, and some staff and national officers. Each staff person is expected to attend an institute at least once during his career. The national union pays travel expenses for one delegate from a local each year, in order to equalize expenses for locals in various parts of the country, and about ten percent of the locals take part annually.

The URW also conducts a number of more traditional conferences and classes throughout the country. In the period covered by the survey, headquarters staff held 34 steward-training sessions, with 950 participants. These sessions ran from 2 to 10 hours each. In 1965 and 1966, the staff also conducted 10 regional weekend conferences which combined union administration sessions with discussion of broad labor issues. These drew 480.

In its summer schools, the URW wants to promote group solidarity and a feeling of identification with the union as a national organization. Partly for this reason, one-week schools are taught mainly by URW and other labor staff, and the union seldom uses universities with labor education centers. The content deals with broad social issues as well as with the traditional leadership skills, and each year some of the schools have both a basic and an advanced section.

In 1965 and 1966, 12 of these schools were held in the United States, with 750 attending. The schools were conducted at union centers like Unity House (the ILGWU's vacation center), resort facilities, and several universities that offer housing but little program aid. The national union pays room, board, and tuition for two students from each local. About 30 percent of the locals participated in 1966, an average year.

The URW has done only a little staff training. Each year at the annual staff meeting various departments explain their functioning and the education department devotes one day to a current topic of importance.

The URW has produced several films and several pamphlets that have been widely used in labor education. A free film library is maintained for the use of locals and staff.

Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union.

1965 membership: 162,000

The education program of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers has put its emphasis mainly on training officers and stewards, conducting staff-training programs as the need arises.

The union sees a special need to train local leadership in grievance handling and bargaining because of the nature of collective bargaining in the oil and chemical industries. Most of the locals are fairly small and both bargaining and contract administration is carried on locally to a large extent. To give locals the skills they need, the union education department holds numerous two- or three-day conferences in the home communities, sometimes for one local and sometimes for several in an area. In addition to the usual steward-training and local union administration classes, these conferences usually discuss arbitration, preparing for negotiations, and organizing. The education department has prepared detailed materials, using a number of cases and examples, on the mathematics of negotiations, grievances, contract language, and arbitration problems, for use in its programs.

In the period covered by the survey the union held 46 such conferences, enrolling 1,400. Three similar programs, held in conjunction with OCAW district-wide meetings, drew an additional 110 local union activists.

The union's summer schools also put stress on bargaining, arbitration, and organizing, but spend more time on economics and broader social issues than is possible in the short conferences. In the survey period, six summer schools were held on university campuses, with 194 enrolled.

Special conferences for local union financial officers were called by the OCAW Secretary-Treasurer's office during 1965 and 1966, primarily to explain how to fill out the various reports required by the union and government agencies. There were 101 financial officers attending these.

During the survey period, the union also held six conferences on pension and insurance plans in conjunction with district meetings. These drew 500.

As the need arises, the union holds staff-training programs. In the period covered by the survey, two two-week sessions were held at union headquarters to give part of the staff additional information on labor law and on negotiating for group insurance and pensions. About half the staff, 50 in all, attended. Another staff-training program during this period took place at two summer schools, where small groups of staff studied a broader range of subjects such as organizing, management planning, economics of the industry, social legislation, and reading improvement. There were 39 in these programs, which were held on university campuses at the same time as schools for local leadership.

In 1968, OCAW embarked on a program to train new staff in one-week sessions held at the Denver headquarters of the union. This is an orientation program for about 10 staff members at a time, to bring them closer to the national union, to tell them what is expected of them, and to explain the resources of the international union and its various departments.

American Federation of Government Employees. 1965 membership: 139,000

In 1962, shortly after President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 giving federal employees the right to bargain collectively, the American Federation of Government Employees embarked on a new educational program to help members and locals understand the change and take advantage of it. Collective bargaining meant new ways of operation for existing lodges, which traditionally had carried on without formal recognition or power. Local leadership had to be trained quickly in the meaning and procedures of the Executive Order--how to organize, get recognition, negotiate, and handle grievances. Moreover, since government workers have traditionally focused on legislation and lobbying as the way to solve their problems, the growing AFGE membership has needed information on the significance of collective bargaining and the changed relationships with management and personnel administrators that it brings.

AFGE membership has grown since 1962 from less than 100,000 to more than 250,000 by 1968, and this upsurge has added to the educational needs of the union. The education program has emphasized the training of lodge officers, stewards, and active members, since they carry a large share of the load of organizing and servicing. The main vehicles are one-week resident schools and an extensive program of shorter conferences.

The conferences, one to three days in length, deal with the Executive Order and agency regulations, steward and officer training, and legislative issues facing government workers. During 1965 and 1966, the AFGE conducted 51 of these institutes around the country, with 4,725 attending. The number of programs was similar in 1967, but more of them were three days long, which the education department considers more satisfactory.

Under a recent decision of the Comptroller General, in 1968 the program for a number of these institutes will include one day's paid administrative leave for members taking time from their government jobs. This decision stated that agencies "may" give up to eight hours of paid administrative leave for education seminars where the education is of "mutual benefit to the employing agency and the employee representative" who attends the seminar. In accordance with this decision, the AFGE has designated one day of their Institute program to be limited to important rules and procedures set out in the agency regulations and the Federal Personnel Manual.

The AFGE's week-long schools on university campuses are also focused on local leadership. Each school has one section for stewards and one for lodge officers. Two schools were held in 1965, and again in 1966, with a total of 319 attending. This program expanded to four schools in 1967. As might be expected in a union that is growing and breaking new ground, a number of the students pay their own way, using their annual leave time.

The schools are considered a key part of the AFGE education program because they provide time to emphasize the goals and philosophy of labor as well as "tool" skills. They thus help active AFGE members see themselves as part of a labor movement, working with other unions, and concerned with broad social issues as well as the special problems of government workers.

Several staff-training programs have been held in recent years. All staff attended a one-week school on white-collar organizing that was held in cooperation with the Labor Education Service of the University of Minnesota in 1965. In 1966 and 1967, one-week programs on collective bargaining were held at Michigan State for selected staff members, with about 25 in each group.

While drawing on traditional labor education materials to some extent, the AFGE has had to supplement them considerably, since government unions work in a framework of regulations and procedures for recognition, negotiating, and grievance handling that differs from that of unions in private employment. AFGE has devoted a good deal of attention to the preparation of materials, an effort complicated by the fact that each government agency has its own regulations and procedures. Materials describing these regulations are continually being compiled by the education staff, and then updated as new regulations are issued or rules changed by contract negotiations.

In conducting its programs as well as in preparing the materials, the AFGE has had the help of the AFL-CIO, the Government Employees Council, and several university labor programs whose staff have made a special effort to learn the complexities of federal government unionism.

International Chemical Workers Union. 1965 membership: 85,000

The International Chemical Workers Union is one of the smaller unions with an education program. A joint Department of Research, Education, Health, and Safety is responsible for the program.

During the survey period, the union held nine short conferences, ranging from one to three days, for steward and officer training. These conferences had 270 participants. In addition, education staff conducted short sessions at seven regional meetings of the union attended by 400.

Two summer schools were held, both in cooperation with the labor education program of Rutgers University. There were 113 local officers and stewards enrolled at these schools. The 1965 school had both basic and advanced sections.

The ICWU has evolved a new kind of on-the-job training program for potential staff members which uses organizing campaigns as the classroom. Five or six active local union officers are selected from their plants and assigned as a group to work with an experienced member of the ICWU field staff on organizing campaigns in an area. For three months, while the trainees organize, they also attend education sessions each week conducted by the supervising representative and occasionally by other union staff or local experts. These sessions deal with ICWU policies, labor law, writing leaflets, steward training, AFL-CIO and labor structure, etc. During 1965 and 1966, 16 persons were trained in this way.

The Chemical Workers Union also holds one-week staff meetings every other year, dividing the staff into two groups each time. Such meetings, drawing 60 field staff and business agents in 1965, had informational sessions conducted by the education department, as well as the usual policy discussions.

Allied Industrial Workers of America, International Union.

1965 membership: 69,000

With its membership in about 350 widely scattered local unions in a great variety of industries, the Allied Industrial Workers of America has developed an education program that is aimed at serving the union functionally.

The primary activities consist of an annual staff-training conference; an annual national one-week resident school for local union leaders; and a biennial series of two-day regional institutes for local union bargaining committee members. There are also occasional steward-training programs and ad hoc institutes as time permits. These programs are conducted by the union education director and two part-time assistants, using other resources from the union and, for some activities, university staff and facilities, particularly the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin.

The staff-training sessions bring together at a university the total national staff of the union, 60 in 1966, for training in such subjects as organizing or specific aspects of collective bargaining. Detailed training materials are prepared. During the years when local union collective bargaining conferences are held, the staff will focus on the same problem areas.

The one-week school brings together 150 to 175 elected or appointed local union officials for trade union training. There are first-, second-, and third-year programs to prevent duplication of experience, as well as special courses for time-study stewards and community services representatives. There is a conscious decision to hold a large national school to build solidarity within the union. The restriction to local union officials provides a focus on those who will use the training when they return home.

The two-day institutes for members of local bargaining committees reach about 1,400 to 1,500 out of a total of about 2,000 in the union. This program was mandated by the union convention to provide national leadership and assistance to local unions. In view of the great diversity of industry and size of locals, the conferences deal with those aspects of bargaining which are most common. Instruction is given by national union staff based on especially prepared materials. An additional 500 stewards and local union officers are reached by the other programs conducted by the national union.

International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers. 1965 membership: 60,000

The educational program of the Brewery Workers centers around conferences for local leadership development, with programs of wider scope held occasionally to deal with industry or union-wide problems.

Conferences dealing with union administration, grievance handling, and bargaining are held in the home communities of the members to train local union leaders, particularly those in newly organized locals. In the period covered by the survey, 43 such one-day conferences were held, enrolling 1,625. During this same period, seven two-day regional conferences emphasizing bargaining were also held, drawing 300. These brought together locals in a region, company, or industry to take part in educational sessions on bargaining and union administration.

A relatively new development is the program of schools organized by industry or company. Their aim, in addition to education on bread-and-butter union subjects, is to promote understanding and solidarity among locals with common problems. In 1967, the union set up its first week-long school for soft-drink workers, held at the University of Wisconsin School for Workers.

A similar school, but one that draws from several international unions, is organized by the Brewery Workers' education staff for unionists in the Quaker Oats Company. While the 14 unions in Quaker Oats work together through an IUD bargaining council, there is no education program for the council. In 1966 and 1967 the Brewery staff organized and conducted week-long schools at the UAW Center in Ottawa, Illinois, which took up communications, grievance handling, and the economics of bargaining. In 1967, locals from seven internationals sent delegates.

From time to time the staff also holds education conferences for locals in the American Tobacco Company, whose workers belong to the Brewery Workers' union and two other unions.

Several years ago the Brewery Workers began to hold national policy conferences for its local union officers and business agents. These conferences serve as an educational rather than a policy-making function and are used for discussing major problems facing the union. The 1965 conference, which featured organizing and union finances, drew 157 participants.

While there is no regular program of staff training, the field staff are brought together occasionally for informative sessions on the union and on their work at meetings held prior to the policy conferences and the convention.

What Causes National Union Interest in Education?

What kinds of national unions are active in labor education? Three categories can be identified, although some unions will fit into more than one. The first consists of those unions which have a long educational tradition; they regard education as a normal function and believe it has a firm place in the union scheme of things. The two clothing-worker unions are examples; their tradition predates the New Deal. The UAW and the Textile Workers Union of America are examples of New Deal unions in which education was always accepted. In general, this group of unions has social goals beyond organizing and collective bargaining, and they view education as a way of involving union members in social action as well as training them for union service. They might be said to exemplify the original tradition of union education in the United States.

A second category consists of mass-production unions with membership in large units, where much of the union effectiveness depends on unpaid local activists. The Steelworkers and the Rubber Workers are examples of the many industrial unions interested in education. The IAM is a former AFL union which turned to education as it gained a large industrial membership. When a union's membership includes both industrial workers and craft workers, as does the IBEW, the manufacturing and utility units are more likely to be engaged in education than those in construction. The CWA also belongs in this second category, although its concern for education is strengthened by the emphasis given training and education by management in the telephone industry. Some of the unions in the first category also fit into the second; and many of the unions in the second category have become involved in social action and have used education to further this interest. Consequently today's programs may be very similar, even though the original impetus for education may have been different.

The third category consists of unions that have turned to education because some event presented problems with which they were not accustomed to deal and may have also provided an opportunity for rapid growth. This is the group that has most recently turned its attention to education. Unions of federal employees are the best examples. After the federal executive order on bargaining was issued, established unions like those of postal employees had to supplement their lobbying activities with bargaining, much of which was to be carried on by local officers. Craft unions in the metal trades needed to develop expertise in dealing with the federal government, and to train local officers and stewards for new functions. A union with small membership like the

American Federation of Government Employees depends on education to train both staff and local leaders to take advantage of the opportunities for growth and then to bargain.

The federal employee unions are the most obvious but not the only ones who turned to education to help meet new problems. The major union in state and local government, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers, reacted in the same way as opportunities for growth developed and collective bargaining became more common. Unions like the Boilermakers and the Molders first resorted to education to help meet new problems in industrial engineering, then broadened their programs as they saw the value of education in equipping staff and local leaders with needed skills.

It is harder to determine why some unions have responded to changes by developing sophisticated educational programs for staff and local leadership while others, after an initial flurry, have settled down to limited activity. It may be that rapidly growing unions like AFGE and AFSCME become more aware of the need than the postal unions, for example, which were already well established. But the Fire Fighters, an established union that began with a small program, is now expanding. This may be a result of differing attitudes in union leadership toward education.

For it is clear that acceptance of education as an institution-supporting function is still the exception rather than the rule among American unions. This is true even though more unions sponsor educational activity than in the past, and the new unions with educational activity include many that frowned upon it years ago. Very few unions that start educational programs give them up. Two of the major unions in the paper industry did discontinue their programs, in both cases following internal political disputes; but this has not happened in other unions which have also experienced internal friction.

We did not query union leaders without education programs to determine their attitudes toward education, but long-time service in unions has exposed us to their ideas. The labor educators to whom we talked have confirmed our general opinions.

Many union leaders do not see any need for training or education. They feel that unionism is a practical matter and is best learned by doing. They point out that the present union leaders at all levels learned in the school of experience and on the whole learned well, as would be testified by the management representatives with whom they conduct bargaining or compete in organizing. These unionists feel that the new generation of leaders will learn as they did, by participating in union activity, and what they learn this way will be tested by their successes and failures in day-to-day union work; thus only those who know what they are doing will rise.

Most often these unionists regard organizing and bargaining as the only union functions, and their interest in government is limited only to government assistance or interference with these functions. They see no need in assisting union staff or membership to understand social problems. In their opinion, therefore, union education is unnecessary.

In some cases this attitude is combined with a suspicion of intellectuals, or of education itself, as distracting to the main goals of unions as they see them. There is a feeling that education will sidetrack unionists into activities that are unimportant or even contrary to the union's best interests.

There is another kind of suspicion of education, particularly among lower-ranking union leaders. Why, they say, should we train members to compete with us for our jobs? We had to work hard to learn what we know and get where we are; why make it easy for others to replace us?

Some leaders also regard the "educated" member as a potential troublemaker, even when not ambitious for office. The classic story in labor education concerns an educator who suggested a course in parliamentary law to his superior. "The members are making too many motions already," is the reported response. While this may not be true in any particular case, it does reflect an attitude that was reported to us by many union educators, even in unions which support education.

In assessing these attitudes it is important to keep in mind that, unlike business, unionism is a democratic institution and union leadership is always conscious of this. Opposition to education is declining, however; it is less popular to express it openly now than it was a generation ago, even if it is felt. The new complications of union operation have shaken the stand that all learning can take place on the job, particularly regarding staff. We discuss this point in the section on staff training. For many union leaders AFL-CIO involvement in politics and legislation has boradened the concept of the union's role in society. But not all the leaders understand the possibilities of education in assisting the unions to meet new challenges.

Some unions feel that education can help support all union activity: bargaining, organizing, political action, or effective administration, as well as to strengthen internal democracy. This attitude is not typical, however. More commonly, education is viewed as a limited function, particularly in training and morale-building for local union officers and activists. In these cases the education staff is, in a sense, one step removed from the major operations of the union, responding to requests for service or carrying on certain traditional programs like conferences or one-week resident schools. In smaller unions where this attitude prevails, there is pressure for the education staff to perform other functions that are regarded as more important.

There are, nevertheless, small unions with a high regard for the importance of education but lacking the financial resources to initiate major programs. Some have pressed for greater initiative in education from the AFL-CIO; they feel that only in an expanded federation program could the educational needs of small unions be met.

National Union Education Activities

Against this background it is appropriate to examine the various activities that were reported by the national unions, in an attempt to provide some idea of the extent of each kind of program and some analysis of each, where it may be useful. Separate sections on two major union programs conducted chiefly by national unions--staff training and one-week resident schools for local unionists--will be found at the end of this chapter and will not be discussed in detail now. Because of the special section on staff training, all the material below deals with programs for local activists.

The main types of activity for local leadership are the short conference, the short course, and the one-week resident school. Of these the most common is the short conference, 33 of the responding unions reporting the use of this technique. We had hoped to obtain meaningful totals on such conferences run by national unions and figures on enrollment, but we found this impossible since figures were not available for the two largest unions, the UAW and the Steelworkers, as well as for some others; consequently, our totals are far below the actuality. For the unions which did give us the information we can supply the following figures: During 1965 and 1966, 17 unions reported 358 one-day educational conferences with an enrollment of 15,643. In the same period, 29 unions ran 1,253 two- or three-day conferences with an enrollment of 37,234. The figures on the longer conferences are thrown out of proportion by the activity of the CWA, which conducts widespread steward and officer training for single local unions through this method, conducting 827 conferences with an enrollment of 9,614 during the two-year period. If the CWA figure is deducted, the totals for the other 28 unions would be 426 conferences with an enrollment of 27,620.

The CWA conferences need to be distinguished from the others because the average size is small enough to permit traditional classroom techniques. Many other unions also use conferences for the training of stewards and officers of individual locals, but in larger groups. In such unions as AFGE, IAM, OCAW, or the Boilermakers, the attendance at training conferences may range from 50 to 100. In the Allied Industrial Workers, the Postal Clerks, the Office and Professional Employees, the conferences bring together officers of many locals on a regional basis. Training at these sessions tends to deal more with general problems. As indicated in the program description, the AIW conferences are closely tied to the union's collective bargaining program. The CWA conferences differ from the others in another way. They are run by field representatives while the others are conducted by national union education staff, headquarters staff in the smaller unions, or field staff if the union has them.

There is a quite different emphasis in the conferences sponsored by the ACWA and the ILGWU. In both of these unions political and social questions are likely to be stressed more than the skills of bargaining or union administration. One union, the Meat Cutters, combines union skills and broader issues in its one-day conferences for local unions.

In the unions with a full-time education staff--and that group includes the ones conducting most of the conferences reported--attention is paid to the methods used and the conferences are thus an educational experience. Some unions like the Meat Cutters work hard at this, particularly since the conference is the union's major educational effort directed at the locals. In unions without educational expertise, however, it may be difficult to distinguish between the conference with an educational purpose and the traditional union session in which the participants listen to speeches and sometimes have an opportunity to ask questions.

We sought information on educational activity conducted as part of other union conferences and on conferences with an educational purpose run by departments other than the national union education department. But the statistics obtained are so scant that we are not reporting them. Both types of activity are common, however. The IAM and the postal workers often arrange educational sessions as part of regular statewide meetings. Other unions will set aside time at meetings of local union representatives called together for other purposes. The topics discussed may vary but in recent years there has been increasing emphasis on political and social questions. The educational quality of these sessions is affected by the same consideration as noted in the paragraph above regarding education conferences generally.

In some unions the education field staff conducts short courses, usually in two- to three-hour classes meeting once a week for six weeks, to train local union stewards and officers. Our information on the extent of this kind of activity is incomplete since neither the UAW nor the Steelworkers has records detailing the programs of their large field staffs. Two unions did report fairly large programs of this kind, the IAM and the AFSCME. In the IAM some of the field staff conduct such courses on a regular basis. During 1965 and 1966 there were 114 with an enrollment of 1,943. Course content varied somewhat from local to local, but generally provided skill training for stewards in grievance handling or for officers in union administration. The AFSCME program is quite different. While the courses are administered by the national education department, they are taught by local unionists who have been especially trained to use a detailed steward-training manual. As is indicated in the program description, the manual and the instructor training are a cooperative venture with the Cornell labor education center. During 1965 and 1966 AFSCME local instructors conducted 286 steward-training courses with an enrollment of 1,969. The UAW has a somewhat similar program for newly organized local unions. Experienced local unionists are trained to use a manual prepared by the national education department. While no figures are available for the survey period, 423 such courses were reported between the start of the program in 1966 and the UAW convention in the spring of 1968. Courses of this type reported by other unions were occasional, totaling 13.

These activities and the summer schools described in detail later in this chapter constitute the major effort of national unions to provide education and training to the activists who carry much of the responsibility for union work locally. It is clear that very few unions have developed a systematic program that will reach throughout the organization on a regular basis. In the UAW this is the responsibility of the locals with the assistance of a large full-time education field staff. We know that a great deal is done, but there are no records that permit a judgment about the amount or character of the educational opportunities offered.

The ILGWU also places the responsibility for leadership training on its subordinate organizations and, as indicated in the program description, these groups employ a large educational staff. But, again, the records do not provide a basis for making judgments on the attention given to this problem.

Making use of its regular field representatives, the CWA has a pattern of regular training for stewards and officers that reaches a high proportion of its locals, especially the larger ones. AFSCME has developed, with some success, the pattern of steward-training mentioned above, based on the development of local instructors, but the program has not yet been spread throughout the union and it is too soon to say whether the effort will succeed. This union is now also in the process of working out a national system for training its officers.

A few of the smaller unions have series of regular regional education conferences that bring together local leaders for limited areas of training. In some of the unions a large proportion of local union leaders participate in these sessions but, as indicated above, the conference functions are quite limited and in some cases the conferences are of poor quality. Probably the best of them are the AIW collective bargaining conferences which deal with limited material intensively. The Meat Cutters' education department offers annual conferences for local activists, but the initiative must come from the locals and, as a result, some areas of the union do nothing.

It is fair to say, therefore, that most national unions with an education program have not undertaken the responsibility for systematic training of all local leaders. In some cases this may be a reflection of limited resources but it seemed clear from our interviews with union educators that it reflects equally a feeling of many union decision makers, either national or local, that such training was not needed or important.

We sought information about national educational activities directed to unionists other than local leadership and staff. This included programs for retired members or for members preparing for retirement; for families of members; and for the nationally elected officers and executive board. Although the information we gathered is limited, it is possible to make some general conclusions in this area.

The UAW conducts the only consistent major program for retired members or those preparing for retirement. The extent of this endeavor was not reported to us, but we do know that the UAW sponsors and participates in centers for retirees in a number of communities, offering a wide range of activities usually on a community basis rather than by union grouping. The UAW has also negotiated programs for preretirement training jointly with the Chrysler Corporation and some smaller companies, and has trained staff and local unionists to conduct union-sponsored programs in preparation for retirement in those companies that have no joint program. The extent of the Chrysler activity during 1965 and 1966 is detailed in the UAW program description. The other unions indicating work in this area encourage locals to take responsibility or in a few cases have sponsored residential centers for retired members.

While 10 unions indicated that they offered educational programs to families of members, in almost every case they were sporadic or involved the encouragement of spouses to participate in programs directed primarily to unionists, as in the one-week resident schools. In a few of these schools, special programs are set up for those spouses who attend. The UAW family education centers, of which the first is now being completed in Michigan, represent an entirely new concept in union education and are not an extension of an already existing operation. The plan for the centers is noted briefly in the UAW program description and will not be repeated here.

One union, the Steelworkers, reported a regular educational program developed especially for its national officers and executive board. The Steelworkers' program description includes a summary of the sessions held so far and other details. At present it is the only effort by a national union to bring to its top leaders the ideas and information of academic experts and others on the basic problems of our society. Impetus for the sessions came from The Brookings Institution conferences described elsewhere in this report. Other unions whose top officials have participated in the Brookings program are reported considering similar activity but none has acted thus far.

A few other unions reported occasional education programs for their national executive board, but these would appear to be rare and they deal with technical information related to bargaining.

Employer Support

At the suggestion of the union educators at our original planning meeting we sought information about employer involvement in labor education through joint programs or through financial support. Aside from the UAW preretirement courses mentioned earlier, nothing was reported in either of these areas. There are two ways, however, in which management supports labor education financially. Under a Comptroller General's ruling, U.S. government agencies may give eight hours of paid administrative leave for educational seminars when the subject is of mutual benefit to the employing agency and the employee representative attending. As a result of this ruling the unions of government employees are organizing their educational conferences so that one day is spent on such matters as agency regulations and general federal personnel practices. If the conference is normally held during working time, this reduces the lost-time cost to the local. If the conference is held over a weekend, the event can be extended one day without lost wages for the participants.

The other possibility of employer support is more complex. The UAW and some other unions have negotiated tuition-refund plans for employees, generally for job-related education in a recognized educational institution. These programs have not been in effect long enough to tell us whether they would cover tuition in university-run, long-term programs or in the labor studies credit programs now being established by some institutions. If tuition for these courses is refunded it would remove a financial barrier either from the individual taking the course or from a local union which may be sponsoring the student.

What Members Attend

We have said so often as to be repetitious that most national union education is directed to local activists and full-time staff. In our interviews with union educators we sought information about the involvement in education of some identifiable groups: new members, young members, women, and minorities. We were interested in special programs directed to these union members, and in their participation in the normal education activity. As would be expected, there are few records, but some impressions are worth reporting.

A number of unions make a special effort to encourage their locals to conduct orientation sessions for new members. This effort usually involves the preparation of a kit of materials to be given to the new member and the development of a suggested outline for an orientation session. Unions which have pressed this program include the ILGWU, the ACWA, the UAW, and the Meat Cutters. The ACWA has trained some local unionists to conduct the orientation session; and in the Meat Cutters' union this type of program is part of the instructor training given to local union staff. However, no union reports great success. An estimate of 15 percent of the locals was submitted by several education directors interested in new-member orientation, and it is fair to assume that no union does much more than this.

There have been no special national union programs for young workers, although all the education directors we interviewed feel strongly that there needs to be a special appeal to them. Young members who do take union responsibility do participate in one-week resident schools and in the educational conferences, but the general feeling is that the age level of those who participate in education is somewhat higher than that of the total membership. This would be expected since it is the more experienced union members who have risen to local leadership. ACWA makes a special effort to recruit young workers for the one-week schools. A UAW check on summer-school participants showed 23 percent under 30, as contrasted with an employment figure of 32.4 percent in that age group in General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford.

The national AFL-CIO Department of Education is experimenting with some special education programs for young unionists, described in the section of this report dealing with the AFL-CIO. One purpose of the AFL-CIO effort is to encourage similar activity by the national unions. The Texas state AFL-CIO has conducted the only other special programs for young unionists.

The UAW is one union that conducts educational activity especially for women members. This is a function of the Women's Department, and its character and extent in 1965 and 1966 are noted in the UAW program description. Educators from other unions indicate that generally the number of women who participate in education is small in proportion to their membership in the union. This may not apply in those unions like ACWA, ILGWU, and CWA, which have a very high percentage of women.

Minorities also seem to participate in education programs to a small degree in proportion to their membership. According to some of the union educators, the minority representatives who do attend sessions are those who have been active for some time and the younger members have not become involved; but this feeling is not universal. A few unions, on a local basis, have cooperated with the Urban League in special classes for Negro members. That program is described later in the report.

Joint Programs

Almost all national union programs are independent of one another. In two instances, however, this does not apply. For a number of years the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen cooperated in a series of educational conferences in the development of a series of home study courses and occasionally in sponsoring local short courses, generally in connection with a university labor education center. Educational activity has declined in recent years in both of these unions.

The other instance of cooperation involves the unions in the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Department who work together to train stewards and officers in U.S. government installations, primarily navy yards, in which the workers are represented by a local Metal Trades Council. A joint committee made up of representatives of the national unions concerned, working with the cooperation of the AFL-CIO Department of Education and the Metal Trades Department, has taken responsibility for developing and conducting training conferences for local activists and for the staffs which serve them. During 1965 and 1966 there were two staff-training sessions involving 81 union representatives, and nine conferences for stewards and officers with an enrollment of 750.

There is one other example of joint activity: one-week schools for leaders of local unions of workers employed by a single company but coming from several national unions. Two such schools were held: one for locals in the American Tobacco Company and the other for the Quaker Oats Company locals. In these instances the education department of the Brewery Workers set up and conducted the schools.

Education Department Responsibilities

In addition to the direct operation of labor education programs, union education departments perform some related functions and others that result from the union's interest in other aspects of education.

Our questionnaire asked for information in both areas but not for any details of time or staff allotted to each. The responses to this question, therefore, are only indicative. In listing the answers we have separated the two categories. In the first, related to their own education programs, ten departments maintain a film library; nine have produced films; seven distribute books; six prepare publications; four prepare course outlines; and two administer home study courses. In the field of general education we find that 15 administer scholarship programs, usually for children of members; seven do some work with the public schools; and three provide advice to the union on problems of education generally.

All unions interested in education encourage their locals to initiate activity. We discuss the general character of local union education later in this report. Here we are concerned only with national union activities that assist locals in developing their own programs. Where there is no full-time local staff, the general structure for local operation is the education committee. As already mentioned, national union field staff in education are expected to assist such committees. In addition, ten unions issue regular bulletins or other material for local education committees, and the same number but not entirely the same ones provide some training for members of local committees.

In some unions--the UAW and the IAM, for example--the bulletins are issued regularly and contain program suggestions and references to resources. CWA has prepared detailed committee handbooks suggesting a pattern of work, as well as a printed manual for local education committees. Other unions issue the material less frequently; it is often directed to specific issues which may have union priority. Most of the training of education committee members takes place at the one-week resident schools, often in a special workshop for this purpose. It tends to be a sporadic rather than a continuing activity. Some measure of its effectiveness will be found in the section on local union education.

National Union Education Staff

Who does the educational work for the national unions? Table IV-2 provides the information we received from the 43 unions reporting some educational activity. In 34 cases there was a staff assigned to work on education at union headquarters. In the others, education was an occasional assignment to an officer or some other headquarters staff person. Only 24 of the 34 unions had full-time headquarters staff assigned to education. This figure, however, both exaggerates and underestimates the attention given to labor education. In a few unions such as the Laborers and the Carpenters the full-time staff reported as assigned to education are also responsible for skill training, with which we are not concerned in this report. In other unions, particularly those with a combined education and research department, several persons work on education so that the total resource may be greater than the services of a single person full time. The Chemical Workers, the Fire Fighters, and the IBEW are examples.

Table IV-2

NATIONAL UNION EDUCATION STAFF, 1967

Type of Staff		Headquarters No. of Unions	Headquarters No. of Staff	Field No. of Unions	Field No. of Staff
Full-Time		24	56	6	38
Part-Time		18	30	8	68
	Total	34 1/	86	10 1/	106

1/ Represents the total number of unions reporting headquarters and field staff respectively.

The UAW has by far the largest headquarters education staff, with 10 in the education department and 5 (of whom 2 are part-time) in the staff-training center. The next largest is the Meat Cutters with five. There are four at the Steelworkers and three each at the IAM and the ACWA. In general the unions with the most significant programs have the largest staffs at headquarters, but CWA runs a major program with only one full-time and one part-time person in headquarters, and the ILGWU has only two at headquarters.

We sought information about the other responsibilities of part-time headquarters education staff. In most unions several were indicated. Research was most common, with 17 responses. The others were political action, 11; bargaining, 9; publicity or editing, 8; organizing, 7; community services, 7; and 10 unions reporting a scattering of other activities.

Only six unions reported full-time field staff for education. Twenty-three of the 38 that were reported are in the UAW. The next largest group is in the ACWA, with six; AFSCME has four; and there are two each in IUE and IAM and one in the Steelworkers.

The 31 Steelworkers part-time educational field representatives dominate that group. CWA has 10, and the same number were reported by the Locomotive Firemen, but they spend little time on education. There are four each in UAW and the IAM; and the IUE and the Boilermakers have three each.

Among the unions with education field staff there is considerable difference in the staff relationship with the headquarters department. Those in the ACWA and the AFSCME are closely attached to the department and in effect carry national programs to the field. This applies generally in the UAW where the regional staff have a dual responsibility: to the union's regional director and to the education department. In the other instances the education field staff are responsible primarily to the regional structure. Those who work part time are usually field representatives with education as one of their responsibilities--often a minor one. The proportion of time they spend on education and the kind of work they do is determined in the region. They work with the headquarters department on educational activities in their region, and in most unions attend meetings of education staff held once or twice a year.

Who are the people who comprise the national union education staffs? There was no attempt to survey them, but we did ask union educators what kinds of people were employed. A distinction should be made between headquarters staff and field staff. Let us consider the field staff first. Nearly all national union education field staff are union representatives who have developed an interest in education. As already mentioned, aside from the UAW staff, most have more traditional responsibilities in addition to education. There are two major exceptions: ACWA and AFSCME. In both these unions the education field staffs are drawn from outside although they may have had experience as union members or have worked with other unions. These outsiders, as they might be called, are expected to have an understanding of and a concern for unions, an ability to work with people, and--hopefully but not always--some previous experience in labor education.

While the ILGWU has no national field staff, it does have a very large education staff attached to subordinate units of the union. Many of the employees originally came from the year-long training institute formerly run by the union; others are outsiders hired specifically for this work; some have worked for the union in secretarial positions and have developed an interest and competence in education; and still others have come from the shop.

Headquarters education staff also includes a mixture of men who have risen from local union operation and those who have come from the outside, sometimes from other unions and sometimes with an academic background. Some unions make a conscious effort to employ their own members. The UAW is one of these. Nine of its 10-person education department are UAW members; a few of them have had academic training or other experience to supplement their union background. There are a few unions with a smaller education staff also composed of people with a background entirely in the union that employs them.

In still other unions the headquarters staff may include persons who have worked in labor education for some time, often in other unions or in university labor education centers. These are professional labor educators whose original background may have been developed in the shop or in academic institutions but who have been in the profession so long that the distinction is no longer drawn. Their labor education experience is what is desired. They are supplemented in some instances, particularly in departments combining education and research, by those with an academic background and an interest in unionism; in other cases by someone from the more traditional union staff who has demonstrated an interest in education. The field is so small that there is no established route to it, and frequently the accident of opportunity is the most important factor.

In almost every union new education staff learn by doing, usually by working for a while with an experienced person. The ILGWU includes newly hired local education staff in its four-week training program for new staff, and CWA provides training in education method as part of the induction training for all staff hired by the union. Some union education staff have participated in the one-week schools in discussion leadership run by the AFL-CIO Department of Education. The Meat Cutters' sessions in educational methods involve headquarters staff as well as local union staff representatives.

A few unions bring together their entire education staff occasionally for conferences, some of which deal with problems of union education or educational techniques. But there is no formal training program that can be said to qualify a person as a union educator.

The question is sometimes asked whether a union educator, no matter the background, is a unionist who works at education or an educator who works for a union. In nearly every case it would be the former.

National Union Expenditures

What does national union education cost? We sought this information in our questionnaire, but it was supplied in only a very few cases. Most union financial reports are not organized so that such expenditures can be identified; and we were warned that in some cases where the reports show an expenditure for education the figures were inaccurate for a variety of reasons. In view of this we made no attempt to arrive at an estimate, even for the unions that returned a completed questionnaire. We can illustrate the problems of calculating costs with two examples:

Expenditures of the UAW national education fund for the year ending December 31, 1966, totaled $536,867. But this does not include the costs of educational activity conducted by other departments of the union; thus the figure must be regarded as far less than the actual expense of education. During the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, CWA spent $126,506 for education and $138,548 for staff training. But this would not include salaries and expenses of field representatives while they taught local union stewards and officers, nor those for the educational coordinators in the field for the time spent in educational work. In addition, the CWA figure for education costs would include some of the room and board for students at one-week resident schools, while in the UAW these costs are met entirely by the local unions.

Problems in Program Development

We asked union education directors what were the major problems in developing their own programs. A few, including some with the largest amount of activity, said that they had no problems that more staff or money could not solve. None replied that union members were not interested in education. A few, particularly in the smaller unions, felt that there was a danger that they would be drawn off into other union activities, particularly in a speriod of crisis such as a strike or a major organizing campaign. In this connection one director pointed out that it was important for the staff to have an interest and be involved in all the union's activities while at the same time jealously safeguarding the union's educational program. This latter was accomplished in part by relating the educational program to union needs and in part by interpreting the importance of education to the union officers and staff.

The most common statement was that education, both as a method and as a union service, was not understood by large numbers of union officers and staff, even where there was no suspicion of it. This attitude, union educators said, was reflected by the low priority given to education and an inability to realize how education could deal with various union problems. Some educators reported an impatience with what seemed to be the slow pace of the educational method. A few union educators felt there was still a suspicion of education in their own union, even though the union continued to support the program.

Locally Initiated Education in National Unions

No national union knows how much or what kind of labor education is being conducted by its local unions or other intermediate groups within the union. Union education staff know which locals are active and may know the total program of some, particularly in the few unions that have a full-time education field staff. But there is no regular reporting of locally initiated activity, even in the Communications Workers of America, which has complete reports of all work done by national staff. Some estimates of the number of members involved in educational activity will be found in the union program descriptions, but these should be regarded as guesses.

As was indicated in Chapter II, we made no effort to survey all local unions, but we sent a questionnaire to 46 various locals that were reported by their national headquarters to have educational programs. Our purpose was to find some examples that might indicate the character of the activity. We received 20 responses. The IAM education department made a few modifications in the questionnaire and sent it to all of its local and district lodges. There were just under 500 returns, representing about 25 percent of all lodges. Of the 456 returns from the lodges in the United States, 175 reported some kind of education program. A tabulation of these questionnaires is found in Table IV-3.

On the basis of the returns the IAM education department estimates that between 30 and 40 percent of the union's lodges participated in some educational activity in 1967. It is hard for us to say whether this projection is justified. We would rather let the figures stand as they are, accepting the fact that a large number of locals actually involved in education probably did not respond to the questionnaire.

Local Education Staff

We asked the national unions to report on locally employed education staff, full-time or part-time. Twelve unions said they had such staff, but three of these (construction unions with small national programs) were unable to say how many. Seven unions reported 53 full-

Table IV-3

LOCAL EDUCATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, 1967

Type of Activity	Yes	No	No Answer
Education at Union Meetings	50	124	1
Education at Stewards' Meetings	95	77	3
Film Showings	57	116	2
Sponsored Short Courses	74	100	1
Participation in Inter-Union Classes	63	111	1
Educational Meetings or Conferences	71	99	5
Students to IAM One-Week Schools	108	65	2
New Members' Education	15	157	3
Education Related to Retirement	24	148	3
Education for Members' Families	9	163	3
Union Library	31	140	4
Local Education Committee	94	79	2

time local education staff. Twenty of these were in the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union whose locals, because of the union's structure, assume nearly all responsibility for education except staff training. There were 12 in the UAW, 7 in the AFSCME, 6 in the Clothing Workers, and the others in the IUE, the Meat Cutters, and the Laborers. Seven unions reported 103 local staff working part time on education, but this total includes 60 from one small union, the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees. The next largest group was made up of 25 part-time local educators in the ILGWU; the others were scattered among the Laborers, Operating Engineers, Meat Cutters, IUE, and ACWA.

Regarding all local education staff, there is some question of how much time they spend on labor education as we use the term in this study. In the construction unions, skill training may take most of the time; in many other unions the local education director may edit a local paper, counsel members with special problems, be responsible for political action, or may possibly be the resident professional for the local, dealing with a variety of noneducational matters. This is certainly the case at the ILGWU, the union with the largest local staff.

Local Education Committees

In our national union questionnaire we also sought information on the number of active education committees in each union. Over the years the union educators have promoted local education committees as a basis for local programs. We have our doubts about the general success of this process unless there is staff available for consultation and support. The returns from the questionnaires tend to justify our view. Twenty-eight national unions responded to this question. Among those which did not were some, including the Steelworkers, with major national programs. Our interviews with education directors indicate that at least some of the figures we obtained were guesses, particularly since each respondent used his own definition of "active." The 28 unions reported a total of 26,000 locals, with 1,649 active committees. This figure is thrown out of proportion by the Postal Clerks, who have 6,500 locals and only 25 active committees; but even if the Postal Clerks' figures are subtracted from the total, the proportion of active committees to locals is only eight percent. Even more important is the fact that 885 of the active committees are in five unions, UAW, ILGWU, CWA, IAM, and ACWA, all of which have national union education field staff, except the ILGWU which has a large local staff. In addition, the UAW constitution assigns a portion of local dues to education, and the 300 active UAW local committees are in the larger locals.

University Education with Local Unions

There is one more measure of local union education that should be mentioned before we describe some specific programs: that is the work of the universities. Of the total 1,066 short courses reported by university labor education centers for 1965 and 1966, 586 (55%) were conducted for single local unions, and 118 for several locals of one union, making a total of 704 short courses, about two thirds, which could be described as part of local union educational programs. Since the locals interested in education are likely to sponsor several short courses in a two-year period, this would reflect fewer unions than courses. In the same period university centers also ran 176 nonresident conferences for single unions, 132 of these only one day long. While we did not ask the number of locals involved, it can be assumed that individual locals or intermediate bodies were the major sponsors of such conferences.

Patterns of Local Education

Most locals in the United States do not conduct labor education. For those that do there is no typical program. This applies even within a single national union. There are certain patterns of local activity in unions with a strong educational tradition, especially if they maintain a national education field staff as in the UAW, or a large local education staff as in the ILGWU. In the ILGWU one may expect a heavy emphasis on social and recreational activity and attention to politics and social issues. UAW local education stresses the training of stewards and officers, both for contract enforcement and effective union administration; it also gives attention to social problems. Thus a UAW education department report covering 11 weeks ending March 23, 1965, listed 97 local union conferences and courses conducted during that period or definitely planned. Of these, 36 dealt with the steward's responsibilities, and 21 others were concerned with problems of leadership. The subjects of the others were varied. But the program emphasis varies even among the UAW locals, and some may use university labor education centers while others conduct their own training programs.

We received detailed reports from three UAW locals. In one, in Los Angeles, the chief educational activity took place at stewards' meetings. This covered a variety of subjects besides steward training. The local also ran quarterly meetings for new members. A local in Anderson, Indiana, devoted 30 minutes to education at the beginning of each union meeting, held monthly meetings for retired members, conducted six short courses during 1967, using the University of Indiana for two of them, and has a local library of about 75 bookss, with 30 borrowings in 1967. Topics for the short courses were steward training, political action, community services, leadership, propaganda analysis, and psychology. Another Indiana local, in Marion, also devoted a half hour to education before union meetings and conducted three short courses in 1967: steward training, union administration, and political action. These were taught by union members who had attended the UAW one-week resident schools.

We received two local reports from another union with a strong educational tradition, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. One was from the Philadelphia Joint Board which has had a full-time education director for a long time. Education activity here included eight short courses, a new-members program, participation in inter-union classes, a conference on social legislation, activities for retirees and in preparation for retirement, and educational tours to the United Nations and to Washington, D.C. Some of the course titles were similar to those in the UAW locals; other courses were in preparation for the high school equivalency examination, and some gave training in dressmaking and millinery. Use was made of both the Philadelphia school district labor education program and the Penn State center. The Cincinnati ACWA joint board has a part-time education director who carries other major union responsibilities. In this city there were quarterly meetings for stewards, giving special attention to politics and legislation; quarterly orientation sessions for new members; after-work membership meetings on political issues; a senior members' club; participation in community services classes and educational conferences, both sponsored by the central labor body; and also participation in the Ohio State long-term program.

To make a contrast we sought information about the local activities of a union without a national education program, the Service Employees International Union (until 1968, the Building Service Employees International Union). Four locals responded. One had no education program. A second, in Syracuse, New York, showed movies regularly at meetings; conducted two short courses, one of which was taught by the Cornell labor education center; participated in community services and other classes sponsored by the central labor body; and had a library of 300 books and 60 borrowings. The primary educational activity of a Maywood, Illinois, local was a stewards' class taught by Roosevelt University. There were also occasional movie showings at union meetings. The California state council of the union reported new-member orientation and two two-day conferences, one on medicare and the other on public employee bargaining.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers encourages local educational activity, while its national activities have concentrated on staff training. We received responses from four IBEW locals, three of which reported educational activity. A large manufacturing local in Cicero, Illinois, sponsored 12 short courses, 10 of which were taught by Roosevelt and the University of Illinois; included some education at stewards' meetings; participated in special resident training programs in industrial engineering; and sent students to the Roosevelt long-term program. There were two short courses each in steward training, leadership, job evaluation, mental health, health and safety, and preparation for retirement. A similar type of IBEW local at Millard, Nebraska, does not have the resource of a labor education center but uses the faculty of Creighton University in nearby Omaha. In 1966 there was one short course in steward training and leadership skills. For 1967 this local planned two courses: one for stewards with about 30 sessions covering a wide variety of union subjects and taught mostly by union leaders, and the other, 14 sessions on broad social problems using teachers from Creighton. The third IBEW local, a statewide organization with headquarters in Chicago, concentrates on training stewards and holds regular one-and-a-half-day conferences for new stewards in groups of 12 and an annual one-day conference for all stewards. This local has made a film strip to assist in training and uses faculty from the University of Illinois center.

We received reports of educational activity from five different local unions in the New York metropolitan area, representing various national unions and kinds of workers: the International Longshoremen's Association in Brooklyn; the newly organized Taxi Drivers; a large local of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union with a high percentage of minority membership; the New York City Council of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; and a Long Island local of the Meat Cutters consisting primarily of chain store workers.

All of these organizations give particular attention to steward training. Two of them, the RWDSU and the AFSCME, have used the Cornell "line by line" training plan to develop their own steward instructors. The Meat Cutters' steward conferences follow the pattern of a program sponsored by the national union.

Several of the locals sponsor short courses through Cornell and participate in inter-union classes initiated by Cornell. The Meat Cutters have worked closely with Cornell in intensive staff training, using new developments in management training adapted to union problems.

All the locals except the Longshoremen's Association did some work in preparation for retirement, either in counseling or in classes. In two of them there were also programs for retirees. Only one, the Meat Cutters, reported orientation for new members.

In New York City, IBEW Local 3 conducts what is generally acknowledged to be the most ambitious local union education program in the United States. While Local 3 did not respond to our questionnaire, we do know enough about the program to indicate its scope. This union draws members from construction, maintenance, repair, and manufacturing. It holds a one-week resident school that is financed through contributions from employers and is open to all members in certain units. Originally the theme of the program was "Clear and Logical Thinking"; recently the study has concentrated on topics more closely related to the industry and the union. Special training programs are offered for promising union members who have graduated from college, and this group is eventually used as teachers. The Cornell labor extension program is widely used: 15 short courses in a recent one-year period and occasionally a full semester course of academic quality. Short courses have included traditional tool subjects; others focus on the broad problems of unionism and the Negro in American history, for example. There is a full-time education director who is responsible for a large skill-training program as well as labor education, but much of the work is done by volunteer education chairmen in the various units of IBEW Local 3.

One other unique education program should be noted, that of Local 688 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in St. Louis. The key to the program is a resident labor education center which is part of the union's health and medical camp just outside St. Louis. Beginning in November 1967, this center has brought together members of the local, in groups of 20, for four days of education organized around controversial issues that are intended to arouse concern among the participants as well as to inform them. The program is conducted by the union's two-man education staff, using a limited number of outside speakers. The officers and staff of Local 688 were the first students, but the program is now directed to rank-and-file members. Special sessions are planned for shop stewards that will combine skill training in shop responsibilities with the broader program. Financial support comes from the union's strike fund. By the end of June 1968 about 300 members participated in this program. For some of them, the training was followed up by book discussion sessions.

The patterns of local labor education described in this section do little more than indicate the variety of activity. It is not possible to draw any conclusions from them about the extent of locally initiated labor education. There seems to be more local education in those unions with a strong national department; yet the two most ambitious programs are sponsored by locals of unions that cannot make this claim: the IBEW and the Teamsters. It would appear that more is accomplished if a university labor education center is involved and if the local has education staff. The major conclusion to be drawn is that we need to know much more about this area of labor education than was possible for us to learn from our study.

The American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations

The traditional role of the federation in the American union movement as a coordinating, helping, and promotional body rather than an initiating one is exemplified by the activity of the Department of Education of the American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations during the period of our survey. Rather than creating and operating an educational program on behalf of the federation it was the function of the department to promote educational activity among its affiliates in national unions and central bodies that had no programs; to urge those affiliates with programs to expand them; to coordinate the educational activity of the affiliates to the extent they desired and accepted coordination; and to assist the affiliates to the extent desired and the staff and other resources of the department permitted. The promotional activities were conducted through personal contact and publications; coordination was effected by bringing together labor educators and other unionists interested in education for general meetings and specific projects and by focusing attention on important issues or programs; assistance was provided through materials, through consultation which combined professionalism and a wide knowledge of the field, and by supplying staff for specific programs.

Since 1967 the pattern of activity has changed to some extent, with greater initiative on the part of the department in two areas: education programs for young unionists, and staff training. The programs for young unionists have taken two forms: a series of one-week schools for students from all unions; and a series of three-day conferences for apprentices in the construction industry. The first was developed and conducted by the department; the second was developed and conducted by the department in conjunction with the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Department. They are intended as models that might be used by national unions and state central bodies. Special materials have been prepared for these projects.

The Department of Education is now developing plans for a permanent AFL-CIO center for the training of union staff, tentatively named the Institute of Labor Studies. A study of the problems involved and the form such a center should take was authorized by the AFL-CIO Executive Council in September 1967. It is expected that the report will be presented to the council during 1968. Since the center will be operated by the AFL-CIO a new dimension will be added to the federation's education activity. A major program in an important field will provide a greater position of leadership in labor education.

The department has already been involved in special projects in staff training, partly on its own initiative and partly in cooperation with others. In conjunction with the AFL-CIO Department of Research it sponsors an annual collective bargaining school. There has also been training in discussion leadership, jointly with a number of national union education directors. It works with the state central bodies in the south in the Advanced Southern Labor School; and it provided leadership and undertook the recruiting for the four-week southern staff schools financed by the National Institute of Labor Education. A number of unions which have begun staff-training programs have turned to the department for help in planning and staffing their programs.

The combination of help in planning and staffing is common in the relationship of the department with national unions and central bodies. Some national unions starting an education program turn to the department for professional guidance. When the unions of federal employees were faced with new methods of operation as a result of the executive order on collective bargaining, the department worked with most of them in developing programs and materials for staff and local leadership. With some, such as the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Department, this relationship has continued. National unions with well-established programs sometimes turn to the department for staff help in particular projects.

The major assistance from the education department to state central bodies involves one-week schools, particularly in those states where there is no university labor education center or where the central body has no full-time education staff. The department also works closely with three regional organizations of state central bodies that were established for educational purposes, primarily to conduct one-week schools: the Southern Labor School, the Tri-State Summer School, and the Rocky Mountain Labor School. The department assists in planning the curriculum and helps provide instructors both from within the department and other sections of the union movement.

The AFL-CIO Department of Education has also worked closely with the state federations of labor involved in the special training programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity through university labor education centers. These are described in detail in the section on special programs of university labor education centers.

The relationship between the AFL-CIO Department of Education and the local central bodies is not so close as that with the state central bodies. However, some of the larger local organizations do obtain assistance for occasional education projects.

The development and distribution of educational materials is another aspect of the assistance offered by the department. Occasionally it will be for a specific program, for the unions in government employment, for example. More often it will be a general pamphlet that can be used as a basis for teaching or as a course reading. The education department also promotes the general AFL-CIO publications among labor educators. Many of these publications deal with economic and social issues, which are a prime concern of AFL-CIO legislative and political work. A manual is prepared each year for the one-week schools of some national unions and almost all of those conducted by state central bodies, including the staff-training sessions of the Southern Labor School. There are different editions to accommodate the special interests of each school. The manual contains background material on the structure and operation of the AFL-CIO, with emphasis on political and legislative activity; readings on current legislative issues, both state and national; voting records; and other course readings. In 1967 four national unions and 18 state central body schools used the manual; total distribution was 3,000.

The AFL-CIO film library is the largest collection of 16 mm. films for labor use in the United States. It is made up of the comparatively few films that have been produced for labor education, other films produced by unions which can be used for that purpose, and a wide variety of films on social problems, many of them made originally for television. The film library is widely used by labor educators both from unions and universities. For most of the popular films there are guides providing background information and suggestions for discussion. The library is also used by local unions for film showing that are not part of organized education programs, and by some public schools for classes on unionism or social problems. The AFL-CIO Department of Education takes the responsibility for promoting the sale of new films particularly appropriate to labor education or other union uses. On occasion it has negotiated with television networks for the educational release of programs that have a special pertinence for union groups.

The department brings together labor educators in two kinds of meetings. One, an annual gathering of all union educators held in conjunction with the University Labor Education Association, generally deals with broad problems in the field. Some parts of the meeting are sponsored jointly by the AFL-CIO and the university association. The other is a quarterly meeting of the directors of major national union departments. It is used in part for consultation about AFL-CIO education activity and in part to focus on common problems of the group. A continuing liaison is maintained with the university association.

The AFL-CIO Department of Education has a staff of seven. While its major task is labor education, some time is spent on problems of public policy in the general field of education.

Other departments of the AFL-CIO also carry on educational activity in relation to their work. The Department of Community Services has a major program, described in detail elsewhere in this report. The Department of Research sponsors the industrial engineering institutes with the University of Wisconsin School for Workers, and the collective bargaining institutes in cooperation with the education department. Some conferences are sponsored by the Department of Social Security, although there were none of these during the period of our survey.

In the past three years the Department of Organization has developed a program for training organizers in small groups. About 100 sessions have been held in that time, primarily for national union staff but also for the staff of the AFL-CIO itself and with groups brought together by state and local central bodies. Some of this work is reflected in the reports on staff training in that section of this chapter.

Some education is also included at meetings held by the AFL-CIO National Auxiliaries. The political arm of the federation, the Committee on Political Education, holds regular regional conferences but they have not been included in this study.

AFL-CIO State Central Bodies

An AFL-CIO state central body is a federation of local unions belonging to AFL-CIO national unions. Affiliation by the locals is voluntary. Of primary concern to the state organizations is trade union activity that cuts across national union lines. Traditionally they have stressed state legislation of special interest to workers: for example, workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, safety, and laws affecting unions as institutions. When the social interests of unions broadened, legislative interest in the states and the nation increased to include such issues as civil rights, housing, and poverty. When the union movement became more directly active in politics there was a concern for mobilizing votes in elections, and the state central bodies became the administrative arm of the national AFL-CIO for this purpose.

In legislative and political matters the state central bodies work with but do not control their community equivalents, the AFL-CIO local central bodies. In some states this cooperation also includes community services, a major program described in detail elsewhere in this report.

State central bodies may also represent the state union movement in relation to the administrative functions of government and to civic and private organizations in the state. They are concerned about public attitudes toward unionism. In some states the central body may promote and seek support for organizing campaigns and occasionally assist in bargaining, particularly during strikes. The latter activities more likely occur in states where unionism is not strong or where there are isolated locals of smaller national unions.

Effective state central bodies are well financed, have a broad scope, and have the cohesive support of unions within the state. Others are limited in their work, with less involvement of local unions and local central bodies and a resulting fragmentation of union policy. In general, it is the first group that is more likely to be active in education since it views education as a tool for understanding the organization's programs and as a vehicle for mobilizing support.

The response to our questionnaire indicates that education is not generally regarded as an important function of state central bodies. Seventeen of the 50 state organizations responded (see Appendix I for list). These 17 states included almost all of those known to carry on continuing educational programs. Three states that did not reply should be noted: Massachusetts, Connecticut, and West Virginia. Massachusetts does have a full-time education director, but he works primarily with the public schools and in public relations. In the past, Connecticut has had a full-time education director with a major program of union education. The West Virginia AFL-CIO works closely with the West Virginia University labor education center in developing a program that relates to the varied activities of the union movement in the state. A number of other state central bodies that did not respond are involved in one-week schools or conduct occasional conferences. The information on one-week schools was obtained from other sources and is included in our tabluations. Other information was not available.

State Education Staff

How much state AFL-CIO education staff is there? All 17 responses indicated that someone in the state organization was responsible for its education program. In five states (Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, and Texas) the person was an education director, not an officer. Two of these directors worked full time on labor education; two worked two-thirds time; and one, half time. In all but one case, other staff representatives of the state central body carried on some educational activity, making a total of 17 persons conducting some educational program in the five states.

Regarding the other 12 states that reported, educational activity was a responsibility of one of the elected officers of the organization. One worked half time on education; one worked one-third time; three worked one-quarter time; and seven spent less than one quarter of their time on the education program. In five instances, other officers of the organization participated, making a total of 19 persons involved in education in these states, in all cases a minor part of their total responsibilities. In the last group of states, Washington added a full-time director of education to its staff early in 1968.

Patterns of State Education

We have tabulated the educational activities reported by these 17 states for 1966 in Table IV-4. The figures for one-week schools are complete for all 50 states. Information on conferences and film showings is limited to the 17 states that responded to our questionnaire.

Table IV-4

SOME STATE AFL-CIO EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 1966

Type of Program	No. of States	No. of Programs	Enrollment
One-week schools 1/	29 2/	26	2,444
Conferences 1/	17	97 3/	5,512 3/
Film Showings	12	687	

1/ Includes some programs with university labor education centers.
2/ Includes all state central bodies involved in four area schools.
3/ Includes 24 conferences for which no figures on enrollment were supplied.

The patterns of activity among the states are more important than the totals shown above. All but four of the states that reported participate in one-week resident schools. For most of the states only one was held in 1966, but Texas and Ohio had four schools each, Michigan three, and Iowa and Pennsylvania two each. The section on one-week schools later in the report discusses the interest of state central bodies in this activity.

The one-week school is the sole or major educational activity in many states; but Texas ran 41 conferences with local central labor bodies, most of them two days long, attracting an enrollment of 2,700; and other states (Michigan, Indiana, and Minnesota) conducted a variety of conferences. Conferences are also important in a number of southern states; Alabama, Arkansas, and Virginia are examples.

State central body conferences in cooperation with local central bodies are often held in an attempt to effectively integrate the legislative and political activity in the state by providing a greater understanding of both mechanics and issues. This has been most marked when union political activity was based on coalition with other groups.

Michigan is the only state that reported regular short courses taught by state staff. One course, taught in various parts of the state, was intended to improve the operation of local central bodies. The course outline was developed in conjunction with the labor education center at Michigan State University.

This record of state AFL-CIO activity does not indicate the relations between the state central body and university labor education centers. We have already mentioned that the West Virginia AFL-CIO regards the university as its education arm and works closely with the university in developing programs relating to the concerns of the state labor movement. The Michigan AFL-CIO also cooperates with the two university centers in that state and much of their activity, not included in our tabulations above, is sponsored jointly with the state organization. In Michigan, too, special programs have been developed for the State AFL-CIO. Many of the Minnesota conferences were conducted jointly with the state university, and since our survey was conducted Connecticut and Massachusetts are using their university centers for conferences on state problems. This has not been the case in other heavily unionized states, even though it is common for the state AFL-CIO schools to be held at university centers where these exist. To some extent the difference in relationship is a reflection of the state AFL-CIO interest in education; to some extent it reflects a history of the relationship between the university center and the state AFL-CIO.

In the south and other sections of the United States where there are no university centers, the activity is conducted entirely by the unions. These geographic areas tend to be those with the lowest percentage of unionism. Some interest in education arises from that very condition; education is one method of building union solidarity where unionism is weak.

Educational Content

Our survey reinforced the assumption that state AFL-CIO education programs in general emphasize the concerns of state labor movements in legislative and political problems. In a few states, however, particularly through the one-week schools, there is an attempt to provide tools for grievance handling and union administration. The state education programs in the south have heavily emphasized race relations and civil rights. In part this has stemmed from the fact that the labor movement nationally moved more rapidly to support minority causes than did the southern communities in which the unions functioned; thus education became a factor in understanding and building support for union policies. A second factor was equally important. Leaders of the southern state central bodies, recognizing their own political weakness, have sought alliances with organizations of Negro voters and have needed to reach their own members with the meaning of this strategy. Southern state AFL-CIO's worked closely with the special labor education project of the Southern Regional Council, to take advantage of its expertise in this field.

Joint State Schools

For a number of years states in which unionism is comparatively weak have cooperated with each other in conducting one-week schools. This practice started in the south in the AFL prior to its merger with the CIO in 1955. There are now two formal organizations: the Southern Labor School composed of 13 state central bodies from Florida west to Texas and Oklahoma and north through Virginia and Kentucky; and the Rocky Mountain Labor School, which includes eight states in the sparsely settled Rocky Mountain region.

The major southwide effort of the Southern Labor School is a one-week school for leaders of state organizations and some representatives of national unions, described in the staff-training section of this report. Florida, Kentucky, and Texas run their own one-week schools for local leadership; Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi join in a one-week school, as do Virginia and North and South Carolina; and Arkansas and Oklahoma. The Rocky Mountain Labor School conducts a single one-week school for the whole region, rotating the location among the various states.

Recently state AFL-CIO organizations have cooperated in more ambitious, federally financed educational ventures. The first of these was the Appalachian Trade Union Council, composed of the state central bodies in the Appalachian region. The Appalachian Council was established so that the state union movements in the area could become involved in the various economic and social development programs affecting the region. Its first project was a conference of Appalachian state union leadership at West Virginia University, which described the governmental programs and explored the trade union relationships. Out of this the Council and the West Virginia University labor education center developed a project to train local unionists for effective cooperation in community action in their home communities. This project was financed by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity covering all the states in the region except Pennsylvania, which received support for a separate program later. The Appalachian project, which has been renewed, has required continuing cooperation among the states because the trainees came from the whole region and educational programs have been developed in the various communities throughout the area.

There is now a similar effort in New England based at the University of Massachusetts. There had been a New England council of state AFL-CIO organizations, but the training program was their first joint educational effort. A third project is now being considered, to be based at the University of Houston, and will include the southern states from Mississippi west and those in the Rocky Mountain area.

It could be said that the interest in educational cooperation that resulted in the Southern and Rocky Mountain Labor Schools came from a common weakness. The new cooperation arises from a mutual opportunity; the federal funding would not have been available to individual states. The AFL Department of Education was the catalyst for the formation of the older organizations and the education staff of the merged federation works closely with them. The catalyst for the Appalachian training project came from within the region, but the idea spread to other geographic areas chiefly as a result of efforts by the AFL-CIO.

State Activities in Public Education

Before ending this section on the labor education programs of state central bodies it should be noted that much of what they regard as educational activity relates to public education in the state, a subject with which this report is not concerned. As indicated earlier, the full-time education director of the Massachusetts AFL-CIO works primarily with the schools; the former education director in Connecticut was also heavily engaged, and the new education director in the State of Washington is expected to spend much of his time in this field. Because it is important to the organizations, we did include one section on this subject in our questionnaire, seeking information on the frequency of specified activities. We learned that six of the 17 states regularly send union literature to teachers; 13 regularly provide speakers for classes; four operate scholarship programs, usually based on an essay contest for graduating high-school seniors; and two have placed books about unionism in school libraries.

Michigan and Texas carried on the greatest variety of activity, both having programs in addition to those listed above. Michigan has worked on special institutes for teachers while Texas has paid attention to youth, conducting a special one-week school for students.

Why Some, More Than Others?

Why are some AFL-CIO state central bodies so much more engaged in education than others? Part of the answer has been given in the introduction to this discussion: the wide variation in the total activity of state central bodies is reflected in their educational programs. In part, there is a reflection of the educational tradition of the major unions in the state; the UAW in Michigan is an example. In part, interest in education may be aroused by the kinds of problems the unions face; our earlier comments on the south illustrate this. But the interest in education of the state union leadership seems to be as important a reason as any. Time and money for education are found when the leadership deems it important. Certainly this has been the reason for the extensive activity in Texas, and it explains why Alabama does much more than other states facing similar problems.

AFL-CIO Local Central Bodies

There are 770 AFL-CIO local central bodies in the United States. They are charged with the responsibility of coordinating union efforts and representing the local labor movement in the community. Their concerns reflect the workers' needs to which the community responds with governmental services, schools, and voluntary health and welfare services. Politics is important to them: first, because they are interested in local government; and second, because voters are organized in communities. In politics the local central body generally works with the state AFL-CIO.

Most local central bodies are small and their officers work without pay. These smaller organizations tend to carry a minimum program aside from political action and in some cases community services. Seventy-two local central bodies have an affiliated membership of 20,000 or more. In general these are large enough to conduct a variety of programs, and it was from them that we sought information about educational activity. A copy of the questionnaire sent to local central bodies will be found in Appendix IX. There were responses from only 15, and while they offer a sample of large- and moderate-sized cities in various parts of the country they do not supply enough information to make a meaningful tabulation of the results. A list of the cities replying will be found in Appendix I. The information from the questionnaires has been supplemented by that received from the community services staff, state central bodies, universities, and our interviews, to provide the description of local central body education that follows.

The major educational activity of local central bodies is community services education. Another section of this report describes this program and its relation to the central labor unions. The information will not be repeated here, but it should be noted that at least 91 local central bodies conducted some form of community services education program in 1966. For many of them it was the only labor education.

Aside from community services, very few local central bodies are initiators of consistent labor education activity. They employ no full-time education staff; rarely even in the larger cities, does any full-time staff member spend part time on labor education; the responsibility for that work is assigned to the education committee, which also handles the problems of public education. In most communities, public education is the primary concern.

In larger communities the central body may conduct occasional conferences on trade union or community problems. If there is a university labor education center in the state, it is likely that assistance for the conference will be sought from the university, although this is not a regular practice. Local central labor bodies may also cooperate in conducting state central body conferences in states that use this educational technique. Texas, Michigan, Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, and Minnesota are examples. While very few local central bodies conduct evening classes on their own, many do sponsor community-wide classes conducted by university centers: short courses and more particularly long-term programs. In states where there is no university center, a few local central bodies may turn to other educational institutions for teachers.

Against this background let us examine some of the specific details, using information gathered from the questionnaire when it was helpful.

We did get some information on education committees. Twelve of the 15 respondents have them. During 1966 three committees met monthly: two, eight times; one, six times; two, five times; and the others, four or less. One of the twelve did not furnish this detail. Generally those communities in which the committees met regularly conducted more education, although one city in which the committee met eight times reported no labor education.

We asked whether other committees conducted educational activity. Aside from community services, to which there was general reference, only Los Angeles listed others; in that community there were twelve, with a wide variety of responsibilities. For the most part Los Angeles committees ran one- and two-day conferences, sometimes in cooperation with the central body education committee. The topics ranged from safety and unemployment compensation to organizing and poverty. Some other large city central bodies that did not report, like New York, are known to have a similar structure, with specialized committees of the central labor body conducting conferences in the area of their responsibility.

Work with Universities

The university reports indicate their involvement in local central labor union conferences. Sixteen university centers conducted 69 nonresident conferences for central labor bodies, attracting an enrollment of 3,001. Almost all of these were for local--not state--groups. There were, in addition, numerous local central body conferences run by state AFL-CIO organizations, particularly in the states mentioned above. Both groups of conferences concentrated on social problems, but those held by the state organizations had a sharper focus on political and legislative issues.

It is generally accepted that, aside from community services, the most common local central body educational activity is sponsoring classes conducted by university labor education centers. About one third (315 of 1,066) of the short courses run by university centers in 1965 and 1966 were for local central bodies. While the bulk (248) of the short courses is concentrated in five states (Michigan, Wisconsin, Connecticut, Illinois, and Pennsylvania) this does not apply to long-term programs. Nine of the 11 universities organize their long-term programs through central labor unions, and in some cases, as in West Virginia, the central labor education committee administers the program locally.

The character of the long-term program is dealt with elsewhere in this report. The central labor union's short courses vary greatly. In many communities they teach traditional tool subjects. Where there is a large program, as in Wayne County, Michigan, the tool subjects are supplemented by courses in labor history, labor law, and others relating to social problems. In a few instances the courses are tied more directly to the concerns of the central labor union. In West Virginia, before the period of our survey, there was a series of classes on central labor union responsibilities. These have been followed by courses on state and local government problems. The state AFL-CIO was involved in establishing this pattern. The specialized training programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, described briefly in the section on state central bodies, are also directly related to the operation of the local central bodies in their community antipoverty efforts.

When a local central body works closely with a university labor education center, there can be a variety of programs including conferences and courses. In these instances the university is likely to be the initiator, proposing activities that the central body will approve and sponsor but which will be conducted by the university. The university thus performs an educational staff function for the central labor body, in the same way the community services labor staff representative performs an educational staff function in that field.

In some states where there are no university labor education centers, local central bodies have turned to other educational institutions for help in classes. We received two such reports: Houston used the San Jacinto Junior College for courses in public speaking and labor history, while Portland, Oregon, reported a course each with the state system of higher education and Portland Community College. New Orleans reported support for the Catholic labor education center at Loyola University, but mentioned no specific programs. It is not possible to say whether these reports reflect a large amount of educational activity in other communities, but experienced labor educators doubt it.

Local Labor Education Associations

There are three areas in Pennsylvania in which local labor education organizations perform the inter-union educational function elsewhere carried on by the central labor union. The Philadelphia Labor Education Association is the oldest of these. It works closely with the labor education program of the Philadelphia school system and with the Penn State center. The Lehigh Valley Labor Education Association, including Allentown and Bethlehem, sponsors the Penn State long-term program in that area. The Penn State Labor Library Committee performs a similar function in Pittsburgh. The Philadelphia Association was an important labor education coordinating agency in the period when the union movement was divided. It may be that these groups provide a pattern of organization which may have meaning now that the UAW, a major union interested in education is no longer affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

Staff Training

It is generally true that most of the active unionists in the United States have developed their skills and understanding through participation rather than through education, and this is particularly applicable to full-time union staff. Only in comparatively recent years have unions turned major attention to staff training.

We sought to determine the extent of staff training and some of the special problems in conducting the programs. The questionnaires sent to national unions and university labor education centers requested information on the extent and character of education and training provided for full-time union staff. Further information was obtained in the interviews, and a special effort was made to identify staff training by unions that did not respond to our questionnaire. This was done in the interviews with the staff of the AFL-CIO Department of Education and others knowledgeable in labor education. Because staff training is expanding, we sought information also on programs that were started in 1967 or early 1968, and those that were undergoing a change in character during that period.

The information obtained from unions for the survey period is summarized in the accompanying Tables IV-5 and IV-6. Table IV-5 attempts to differentiate among the various types of national union staff-training programs by length of the sessions, with special identification of those programs that do not fit a pattern. We have included in the figures only those programs that were set up exclusively for training. Union-sponsored, inter-union programs are detailed in Table IV-6. Since many unions do have educational sessions in conjunction with staff meetings we have provided this information in Table IV-7.

In addition to the tables we have described the staff-training efforts of individual unions in Appendix II. The description includes some information about programs conducted in 1967 and the early part of 1968, particularly for those unions that conducted no staff training in 1965 and 1966 or that changed the character of their activity. We have also included in this appendix a brief history of staff training.

Since we obtained our information about staff training from union headquarters, the tables and description of activity include only those programs in which the national union or the AFL-CIO was involved. From the university reports we know that some staff training was initiated by local or regional units of national unions and, in some cases, by university labor education centers. Table IV-8 summarizes the information about staff training obtained from the universities. We have extracted from the university reports those projects that were not reported by unions and have provided the information in the second part of this table.

Summary of Statistics

Summarizing the information in these tables we see that during the survey period 17 national unions conducted 85 staff-training programs of some kind, aside from the training given at staff meetings. The 85 programs enrolled 2,513 participants but not necessarily 2,513 different people; as is the case with all our statistics, we do not know how many individuals attended more than one program. In the same period there were 11 union-sponsored, inter-union programs enrolling 400. Fourteen unions had some educational activity at staff meetings, enrolling 3,818. Of the 14 unions, eight conducted no other staff-training programs.

In the same period 14 university labor education centers were involved in 68 union staff-training projects, with 2,323 participants. Subtracting from these programs those also reported by unions, we find 44 programs involving 1,389 participants conducted by universities independently of national unions and the AFL-CIO.

There are no comparable figures on staff training in any other period, but discussions with practitioners and union officials indicate that both the unions and the universities are doing much more now than in previous periods. The UAW Studies Center is less than 10 years old.

Table IV-5

UNION STAFF TRAINING, 1965 and 1966

NATIONAL UNION PROGRAMS

One-Week Programs, Regular Staff

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
Government Employees	2	68	yes
Allied Industrial Workers	1	60	yes
Brick and Clay Workers	1	30	no
Laborers	5	247	no
Machinists	2	176	yes
Meatcutters	4	109	yes
Oil, Chemical, Atomic Workers	2	39	partially
Retail Clerks	3	500	partially
Upholsterers	3	55	yes
Totals	23	1,284	

One-Week Programs, New Staff

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
Machinists	2	71	no
Newspaper Guild	1	12	no
Totals	3	83	

Two-Week Programs

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
Oil, Chemical, Atomic Workers	2	50	no

Three-Week Programs

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
UAW	14	198	small part
United Steelworkers	3	60	no
Totals	17	258	

Union Staff Training, Nat'l Union Programs, Table IV-5 (cont'd)

Four-Week Programs

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
ILGWU (new staff)	4	50	no
UAW	1	21	no
Totals	5	71	

Two- and Three-Day Conferences

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
IBEW	12	250	no
AFSCME	12	190	no
Totals	24	440	

Short Courses and Similar Programs

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
ILGWU	4	249	no
Upholsterers	2	32	no
Totals	6	281	

Miscellaneous Programs Not Fitting A Pattern

Name of Union	No. of Programs	Number Trained	Character of Program
CWA	2	28	New staff, combination academic and union training, field experience, six months
Chemical Workers	3	16	Potential staff, union training during field experience, three months
Totals	5	44	

Table IV-6

UNION STAFF TRAINING, 1965 AND 1966

INTER-UNION PROGRAMS

Name of Program	Length	No. of Programs	Number Trained	University Labor Educ. Center Used
NILE Southern Staff [1]	4 wks.	2	38	no
AFL-CIO Indust. Engineering	2 wks.	2	124	yes
AFL-CIO Collective Bargaining [2]	1 wk.	2	52	yes
AFL-CIO Discussion Leadership	1 wk.	1	20	partially
Advanced Southern Labor School	1 wk.	2	85	no
AFL-CIO Metal Trades Dept.	1 wk.	1	45	no
AFL-CIO Metal Trades Dept.	3 days	1	36	no
Totals		11	400	

---

[1] This program is included in the union-sponsored group because the AFL-CIO Education Department cooperated in developing and conducting it.

[2] For one year the University of Wisconsin School for Workers sponsored this program. The second year it was sponsored jointly by the AFL-CIO and the School for Workers.

Table IV-7

UNION STAFF TRAINING, 1965 and 1966

TRAINING AT NATIONAL UNION STAFF MEETINGS[1/]

Union	Number of Participants
Brewery Workers	52
ACWA	1,225
CWA	11
IUE	15
Glass and Ceramic Workers	62
ILGWU	405
International Chemical Workers	60
Laborers	550
IAM	550
Meat Cutters	533
Molders	21
Packinghouse Workers	24
Painters	50
Rubber Workers	260
Total	3,818

[1/] We asked unions to identify those parts of staff meetings that were conducted as educational sessions; that is, as though they had been set up purely for education or training purposes. In most cases the sessions were conducted by the union's education department. Most often one day (sometimes more) of the staff meeting was devoted to education.

Table IV-8

UNIVERSITY TRAINING OF UNION STAFF, 1965 AND 1966

All University Programs

Nature of Program	No. of Universities	No. of Programs	No. of Participants
Short courses	2	20	294
Nonresident full- and half-time courses [1]	2	4	90
Short conferences (1, 2, or 3 days)	5	18	970
1-week resident schools:			
single union	9	16	696
inter-union	1	2	52
2-week resident schools, inter-union	1	2	124
Long-term single union (for CWA)	1	2	28
Long-term inter-union (Harvard)	1	4	69
Totals	14 [2]	68	2,323

University Programs Not Reported By Unions

	No. of Programs	No. of Participants
Short courses	20	294
Short conferences (1, 2, or 3 days)	12	857
Nonresident full- and half-time courses [1]	4	90
1-week resident schools, single union	4	79
Long-term programs (Harvard)	4	69
Totals	44	1,389

1/ These are courses that met regularly for a half day or a full day over an extended period.

2/ Total indicates number of universities that did some staff training.

Another major continuing program, that of the Steelworkers, was started in 1966. Unions without nationally sponsored internal education programs (for example, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and the Papermill, Pulp and Sulphite Workers) have begun staff training. Rapidly growing unions of government workers like the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees and the American Federation of Government Employees have made staff training a part of their educational programs. The number and variety of inter-union programs sponsored by the AFL-CIO have increased. The record of university staff-training activity reflects the concern of local and regional units of national unions in this field.

Why An Increase

This interest in staff training reflects a number of developments in and pressures on the labor movement. There has been a growth and bureaucratization of the union, requiring greater attention to the problems of communication among various levels in the hierarchy. Laws such as the Taft-Hartley and the Landrum-Griffin have required specific information. Bargaining has become more complex as it deals with problems of industrial engineering, automation, pensions, or health and welfare. The growing sophistication of management in bargaining and in opposition to organizing has focused attention on weaknesses in existing union practices. The increased involvement of unions in politics and legislation requires union staff to function in areas in which some were unfamiliar. The civil rights revolution has made a sharp impact. Moreover, the younger members of the staff have not lived through the days of rapid growth in unions that enabled the older union representatives to learn while doing.

These reasons were summarized in a statement by the president of one international union to its executive council, explaining the need for a recently inaugurated staff-training program. The union involved is of medium size and in recent years has conducted no educational activity of any kind. The union president listed three reasons for establishing the program: (1) the need for closer relationship between the headquarters and the national staff; (2) changing conditions have created problems with which the staff are not prepared to deal; and (3) it is a responsibility of the national union to provide the staff with the necessary training and modern labor-management techniques.

Union educators with whom we talked supplemented these ideas. Some stressed that the quality of unionism was determined by the effectiveness of the staff; others pointed out that staff responsibilities could no longer be learned on the job; and a number related staff education to the need to develop an understanding of the potential role of unionism in American society. Experience might enable a union representative to be effective in his own day-to-day work, an education director of a major union pointed out, but staff education was essential if unionism is to be a social movement.

Withal, as the tables indicate, only a small number of unions conduct staff training on a regular basis; and only a small proportion of the full-time union staff--local, regional, and national--have had any formal training. Most are still preparing for their jobs by experience as local union activists and learning new responsibilities as they go along.

Union Staff Training--How Set Up

Unions that view education as assistance in meeting the problems of their staff members respond in different ways. A few, like UAW, CWA, the Meat Cutters, the Steelworkers, and more recently AFSCME, have set up continuing programs that aim at reaching the entire union staff. In UAW this has meant the creation of a separate department for staff training. This was also the case in the Ladies' Garment Workers Union when the Training Institute was first established, although staff training and other education are now combined. In CWA, staff training is a concern of an executive officer, the same one to whom the education department reports. In both the Meat Cutters' and the Steelworkers' unions, staff training is a major function of the education department.

Some moderate-sized unions, the Allied Industrial Workers and the American Federation of Government Workers, for example, concentrate on a one-week annual program, either for the entire staff or for part of it. In most cases such programs are run by the person responsible for education in the union, either in a separate education department or in a department combining education and research. Where such departments exist this is also true of those unions in which staff training consists mainly of short conferences. There is much more direct involvement of the officers in the training conducted by those unions without strong national education programs: the Painters, the Papermill, Pulp and Sulphite Workers, or the Retail Clerks, for example.

We have made no effort to distinguish between the training of staff on the national payroll and that locally employed, since this factor seems clearly to relate to the union structure more than to anything else. In some unions doing staff training (ILGWU, Meat Cutters, and Upholsterers are examples) most of the staff are locally employed and staff training is focused on that group. In UAW, the Steelworkers, and CWA, the national union is the major employer and consequently the program is directed to the national staff. The AFSCME makes a conscious effort to mix local and national staff.

Just as there are differences among unions in the structure of staff training and the amount of time and effort allotted to it, so are there differences in objectives. Some broad programs like those of CWA and the Garment Workers pay special attention to new staff, and at present that is the only concern of the Chemical Workers. The Machinists, and the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers have set up headquarters orientation programs for new staff. But other unions such as UAW and the Steelworkers, which have continuing training programs, mix new and old staff in their regular sessions. UAW is now preparing a special program for new staff.

Variations also occur in content objectives. Some programs, particularly the short conferences and the training at staff meetings, seek solely to get a better understanding of union policies and programs, and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them from the traditional union staff meeting in which policy and program are outlined from above. One-week staff schools frequently combine union policy with technical training in such areas as organizing, bargaining, and union administration, usually giving some time to a major social issue like the urban crisis. Other one-week programs will deal with a specific staff responsibility--organizing or bargaining, for example. Organizing is the sole focus of the new program of the Textile Workers Union, and both the Allied Industrial Workers and the American Federation of Government Workers have used a full week for specific aspects of bargaining.

While the practical usefulness of the education is usually the measure of what is done, the longer programs often attempt to provide background in union history and structure, economics, and political and social problems. The 12-week academic side of CWA training for new staff has no skill objectives but concentrates on the social sciences with attention to other aspects of the liberal arts. Broad social issues are a part of the Ladies' Garment Workers' program for new staff. The Steelworkers' staff program, concerned primarily with skill training, regards economic understanding as a background tool and allots more time to economics than to any other single subject. The UAW staff-training program regards the solution of community social problems as one of the skills with which staff members should be equipped; it also devotes time to some "far out" subject which may not be directly related to the union's concerns. Many of the longer programs, too, want to encourage reading as a habit and, toward that goal, provide training in reading comprehension and speed.

In the staff-training efforts of the national unions one cannot overlook the factor of solidarity and morale. Staff training is new to many unions, and there is often suspicion of it, particularly among experienced staff who feel that they have learned the hard way. Like the businessman who asks when the professor last met a payroll, union staff want to know when the instructor last organized a shop, won a strike, or negotiated a contract. But with few exceptions the actual programs have created an enthusiasm for the union and oftimes for education itself. Union staff get reinforcement from seriously considering their problems in an organized way. Those unions that report on student evaluations--the UAW, the Steelworkers, and the Meat Cutters, among others--indicate almost uncritical enthusiasm.

Inter-Union Training

The generalizations presented above apply to inter-union programs as well as those offered by individual unions. As is indicated by their titles in Table IV-6, the inter-union programs are more likely to be sharply focused on a content area that cuts across union lines. Industrial engineering is the best example. But this was also true of the NILE Southern Staff Training Institutes, for the south is both an underdeveloped and a problem area for unionism. Thus the focus on the south became more important than the different practices of the various unions. The discussion of southern economic, political, and racial problems had a more immediate relevance than it would have if unionism were well established throughout the area.

The 13-week program at Harvard, described in some detail in the university program descriptions, is quite different from anything else. It is an inter-union program that draws its students primarily but not entirely from national unions which do not promote educational activity among the local union leaders and active members nor do they conduct staff training. The subject matter is mostly skill-oriented but in considerable depth because of the length of the program. The longer time also permits greater exchange of experience among the different unions represented, thus opening an opportunity for examination of the policy consideration behind the skills being taught. But the general goals do fit in with the desire of the unions for staff efficiency. Unions that use Harvard seek to obtain this end by providing fewer persons with more complete training, as contrasted with those unions that provide short periods of training for larger numbers. Another consideration may be the unwillingness of the union to take responsibility for developing its own staff training, seeking rather to take advantage of existing opportunities in programs conducted by others.

By bringing together a greater variety of experience all inter-union programs add a broader dimension to staff training. This is obvious in a program as long and broad as Harvard's, but it is also true in training on a technical subject like industrial engineering. Participants not only learn about other unions; they must also be able to defend policy positions taken for granted in their own organizations. The concept of a labor movement as something more than a group of unions takes on greater meaning.

University Staff Training

Altogether, 14 universities conducted 68 staff programs during the survey period (see Table IV-8). Six of the 14 had only one program each, meaning that staff training had been a serious effort for eight university labor education centers, including Harvard, which conducts staff training exclusively. Nineteen of the 20 short courses were conducted by Cornell, chiefly with single unions, and most of them were planned around a pressing union problem, often using highly sophisticated training techniques. The two California centers were involved in a number of staff conferences, in UCLA with the staffs of individual unions while Berkeley set up a number of inter-union sessions for local union staffs. The Berkeley programs deviated from the general pattern of staff training by dealing with broad social issues.

One- and two-week resident schools made up the bulk of the other university activity. Sixteen of the 20 of these were cooperative efforts with national unions or the AFL-CIO. The other four were programs for local or regional staffs of single unions. Of the 20, six were at the University of Wisconsin (four inter-union); four at Michigan State; three at Roosevelt (all Meat Cutters); and two at

Michigan-Wayne State. The others were scattered. The concentrations at Wisconsin and Michigan State reflect in large part the special competence of some of the staff at these centers: industrial engineering at Wisconsin, and staff training generally at Michigan State. In addition to the two one-week schools, the Michigan-Wayne center conducted the academic side of the CWA induction training for new staff during the period of our study.

Some additional universities have become involved in staff training in the period since our survey was made but prior to the completion of this report. The IBEW has held sessions at Illinois and Cornell; TWUA held two sessions at Rutgers; the Papermill, Pulp and Sulphite Workers met at Illinois and Rutgers; the Laborers at Indiana; AFSCME worked with American University; and Iowa hosted the AFL-CIO school on testing in industry. All were one-week programs except those in Indiana and American which were two weeks long, and all involved unions that had not reported this type of activity during the survey period. American also conducted some inter-union short courses for staff.

Problems in Staff Training

The structure of U.S. unionism is decentralized; all labor education follows this pattern, including staff training. Each national union seems to want to develop and conduct its own program, some working with universities and some with the AFL-CIO, but in each case controlling what is done. The resulting programs, therefore vary in quality according to the competence and concern of those in charge. This is compounded by the fact that very few university labor education centers do enough staff training to develop special competence. A union group going to a university center cannot take for granted that there will be expertise for staff training to the same extent as found in the training of local union leaders and activists.

Both union and university labor educators who have trained staff indicate there are special problems. Materials must be carefully prepared, more specific, and in greater depth than for local unionists. There must be sufficient time to deal with each subject carefully, if an educational experience is to take place. Instructors must be highly competent in their fields and must be able to communicate effectively. The traditional methods of labor education, particularly discussion, are usually not successful in changing practices of long standing in a field in which the student has had practical experience such as organizing. Yet few alternatives have been tested.

If these problems are to be dealt with they require a highly competent faculty whose primary educational concern is union staff. Such a faculty would need to be close enough to union operations to see the relevance of education to them. It could follow training developments in other fields to see which might be appropriate to union staff. Members of such a group could interact with each other and with union practitioners, with a view to effective programming and development of materials. They could be a resource for new programs.

Such a group does exist for one union, at the UAW Studies Center. The resulting experimentation in teaching method and materials is noted in the description of the UAW program in Appendix II. The concentration on staff training in the ILGWU, the Meat Cutters' union, and the Steelworkers' union does develop specialization for those who run the program but without opportunity for exchange of experience. Several members of the AFL-CIO education department have developed expertise in staff training and they advise unions on program planning and resources in universities and other unions.

Another type of faculty for staff training has developed in specific subjects, as in industrial engineering, growing out of the Industrial Engineering Institutes. The core of this faculty is at the Wisconsin School for Workers and the AFL-CIO Department of Research, but it includes some people from other universities and national unions. The industrial engineering group has worked together so long that the various aspects of the field have become defined, and training materials and even a training style have been developed. Unions seeking such training tend to go to the School for Workers, and those who have taught in the Institute have become a resource for industrial engineering programs conducted by other universities, whether for staff or for local leadership.

That staff of the AFL-CIO Department of Organization which trains organizers is, in a sense, a small faculty with specific training objectives and style.

There are experts in other areas of union work, like arbitration, bargaining, or labor law, who are used in staff training. Those in universities teach for unions as well as in their own and other centers. Those from the AFL-CIO departments are also used in a variety of programs, and those from national unions generally teach only in their own unions. But these are generally individual operators, not constituting a faculty in the sense this term has been used, since they have not worked together as have the teachers of industrial engineering. One result is that there is no generally accepted body of teaching materials for most of the content areas of staff training.

It should be said too that no faculty for union staff training has developed at Harvard, despite the long experience there. One reason is that the Harvard program is unique; no other staff-training program gives so much time to any one subject. But the other is that nearly all the instructors in the Harvard Trade Union Program are interested primarily in their own university; the union teaching is secondary to their other university commitments.

AFL-CIO Future Plans

As this report is being prepared the AFL-CIO has recognized the importance of training and education for union staff and is moving to establish an institution that will fill that need. The AFL-CIO Executive Council has instructed the Department of Education to survey the existing experience and the interests of the unions and to suggest a structure and a plan of financing that would be appropriate. The survey is now under way.

It is too soon to predict the results of the Department of Education survey or the form such a training center would take. In a report to a meeting of labor educators in the spring of 1968 the director of the department indicated that any center set up by the AFL-CIO would make use of the experiences of university labor education centers as well as those of the unions.

One-Week Resident Schools

One-week resident schools have long been a major program for educating officers and active members of local unions. In this section of the report we are discussing both the general one-week schools (often called "summer schools"), which cover a variety of subjects, and the more specialized one-week schools that deal with one subject like labor law or organizing. Among the specialized schools that are included in the figures in in Table IV-9 are legislative institutes, teacher-training institutes, and the five-day schools for financial officers.

All these programs have in common a student body composed largely of officers, stewards, committee members, and other activists who are not full-time staff (although occasionally local staff such as business agents may attend). Since there is constant turn-over in this group, the need for basic leadership training never ceases. The residential program, which takes people away from home for five or six days, offers concentrated training and at the same time a way to use labor education staff to reach a number of different locals at one time.

One-week schools are initiated by union groups, although universities often cooperate in this labor education activity. Most schools are sponsored by national unions, but the state AFL-CIO bodies also run a number. In some unions they are the main educational activity offered by the national union and often they are the first kind of program conducted by a union that is getting into the field of labor education. For both national unions and state bodies the schools provide a highly visible program that can be set up centrally, costs relatively little, and offers educational service to large sections of the membership.

In the two-year period covered by our survey, 22 different national unions ran 253 one-week schools, with 19,085 enrolled. The statistics on state central body schools cover only the year 1966, showing 26 schools in that year with 2,444 enrolled. In addition, there are a few schools initiated by regional or state units of national unions in cooperation with universities. These programs, which are not nationally sponsored, had 356 enrollees in the two-year survey period.

These figures do not differ greatly from those in an unpublished 1962 survey made by the AFL-CIO education department. This survey found that in one year (1962) 17 national unions conducted 113 schools with 8,493 enrolled. The same year, 15 state central bodies and 4 groups of such bodies conducted 23 schools with 1,590 enrolled. This totals 136 schools for one year, with 10,083 enrolled. (To compare these figures, our survey statistics must be adjusted because they

Table IV-9

ONE-WEEK RESIDENT SCHOOLS FOR LOCAL UNIONISTS, 1965 and 1966

Type of Sponsor	No. of Different Sponsors	No. of Schools	Enrollment
National Union	22	253	19,085
State AFL-CIO	29 1/	52 2/	4,888 2/
Other 3/		10	356
Total		315	24,329

1/ Includes all state central bodies which joined in sponsoring four area schools.

2/ We were able to get exact figures for 1966 only. We arbitrarily doubled those figures to arrive at a two-year total. A check of an AFL-CIO Department of Education list of 1965 one-week schools that is nearly complete indicates that the number of state schools for both years was about the same.

3/ One-week schools reported by universities, usually with units of national unions but without national union sponsorship.

cover a two-year period for the national unions.) In general, it appears that one-week schools are continuing at much the same rate during the 1960's, with a few different union groups now sponsoring schools and a few others dropping them.

The one-week school has several functions, depending on the union group and the way it is conducted. It is, of course, a way of providing concentrated training on subjects and skills in which there may be little union education available back home. Equally important, it brings together people from different locals, different towns, and different kinds of factories or working conditions, who exchange experiences and ideas and get broader perspective on their own situation. Since most schools spend time on current social issues that concern the labor movement, students also emerge with more understanding of labor's goals in society. Thus a one-week school expects to change the student's image of his union and the labor movement as well as to give him training that will be useful in day-to-day local union activities.

The traditional program for a one-week school, dating back thirty years, combines three elements: (1) union history, structure, and problems; (2) skill-training in a range of subjects such as public speaking, bargaining, contract administration, political action, arbitration, and union administration; and (3) the social, political, and economic concerns of labor. There is, of course, great variety in emphasis, depending on current problems and goals of the sponsoring group.

This general basic program is sometimes referred to as a sort of smorgasbord, to introduce relatively unsophisticated local unionists to a variety of union concerns.

The school usually opens on a Sunday evening, closes late on Friday, runs classes each day for most of the day, and has several evening programs. With this schedule there is little homework required, but students are encouraged to read the numerous printed materials available, and classes like public speaking often require extra work. The discussion method is supplemented by lecture, films, role-playing, and other techniques as the subject warrants.

Attendance at a school may run from 20 to 150 persons. It is more difficult to weld the students into a group at the larger schools; 50 is often thought a desirable limit, but practical considerations may require otherwise. In most schools the students are divided into small groups of 20 or so for classes, whenever possible, with the entire group brought together for speakers and evenings programs. Small classes are generally favored because they promote participation, but some unions use large groups for any topic that is being presented through lecture or films.

In most such schools, there is an effort to build group spirit and morale, by having the members live and eat together, by recreation and social activities, and by a general effort on the part of the staff to get students to know one another and the staff.

National Union Schools

Most of the schools run by national unions follow this general pattern. In the survey period there were 253 one-week schools sponsored by 22 different national unions. Many of these unions held only two or three schools during the period, however, and 213 of the 253 schools were sponsored by 7 of the larger unions (AFSCME, ACWA, CWA, IAM, UAW, URW, and the Steelworkers). All seven unions except AFSCME ran general-purpose schools, but because they have substantial programs they have all varied or added to the traditional pattern in one way or another. These varying approaches will be discussed in detail to illustrate some of the problems and uses to which schools can be addressed.

The UAW held 44 schools during the 2-year survey period, with 6,195 enrolled. Thirty-four of these schools were general programs for local leadership, integrated around a theme known as Core. Each year the UAW selects a different Core theme and prepares a number of carefully thought-out materials for use at schools. In 1965, the Core program dealt with the issues in "The Great Society"; in major contract years the Core theme centers around the bargaining program for that year. In 1967, for example, the program featured UAW bargaining, five of the mornings being devoted to each of five major aspects of this subject: Economics, Technology, and Bargaining; Goals in 1967; Bargaining and the International Corporation; The Bargaining Table and the Ballot Box; and The State of the Unions. Thus the Core program unifies many broad topics around one theme.

The Core program usually occupies the morning, while various tool workshops are scheduled for the afternoon.

In the Core schools most teaching is done by union staff, using instructors' guides from the UAW Education Department. Basic information on each Core subject is supplied by especially prepared fact sheets which are given to the students. Following the instruction guide, the teacher may show a film, have students read aloud from the fact sheets, ask suggested questions, divide the students into buzz groups, conduct role-playing, or use other techniques. Materials and instructors' guides are imaginatively prepared, although they sometimes cover a great deal of ground in the allotted time. They are supplemented by a Basic Fact Book and numerous pamphlets and paperback books which are available to the students.

The UAW runs most of its schools in union and other facilities; it used university labor education centers for only eight schools in the survey period. It prefers to use its own staff to do the teaching even though this makes teacher preparation difficult in some cases and the quality of the classes uneven.

In addition to the 34 Core schools, the UAW also held 10 schools for local union officers that were aimed to give deeper understanding of problems facing unions in our society. These schools can be regarded as advanced both in content and in the student body since they included local officers who had attended Core schools. Often the program for one day is built around one issue, with a leading expert to speak and conduct the discussion.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers is another union that is now programming its schools around a theme, recently the role of the citizen in a democratic society, and how a person works through the union to strengthen democracy. During the two-year survey period, ACWA held 10 schools with 650 enrolled, but the program has been expanding and in 1967 there were 12.

The ACWA program takes up the union and the industry, then moves on to its main subject, discussing citizen participation, changes in our society, the depression, the New Deal, and present problems facing us. Each day the subject is dealt with through presentations followed by discussion in small groups and later afternoon workshops on what the locals can do about these problems. Since ACWA wants to keep this closely tied to the union, they use their own staff for teaching and rarely use university labor education centers.

The United Steelworkers, which conducted 42 schools with 4,700 enrolled in the two-year survey period, developed its school program some years ago around the idea of the individual development of members in the union-plant relationship, the community, and the world of ideas. From the beginning the Steelworkers' union has relied on universities to house and teach its schools, and in the survey period 29 of the 42 schools were held at universities with labor education centers and the others at other universities. The program, unlike those of the ACWA and the UAW, is designed with the expectation that students will return for several years, and it offers a four-year curriculum wherever the size of the registration permits. The subjects are the union and the job (first year); the role of a citizen (second year); leadership problems (third year); and the world of ideas, with emphasis on the humanities (fourth year). Some recent schools have varied the pattern of the four-year program and the union is now evaluating it with an eye to possible future changes.

The problem of what kind of program to offer people who have been to one school and return for another has been met by other unions in various ways. Some unions run more advanced sections for this group simultaneously with the basic school. Others have separate schools. The Machinists' union, for example, holds a number of both basic and advanced schools each year. (During the survey period IAM had 1,147 enrollees in 25 schools, of which 9 were advanced; the other 9 schools listed in the statistics were for financial officers.) IAM basic schools follow the traditional pattern, dealing with a variety of subjects; but advanced schools concentrate on one subject area such as bargaining, public relations, or community action. The CWA also has a first- and second-year school program, organizing its second-year schools around more sophisticated treatment of both union activities and general social issues. Smaller unions like the Boilermakers, the International Chemical Workers, and the Rubber Workers also plan special advanced programs in some of their schools.

Single-Purpose Schools

In addition to these adaptations of the general school pattern, a number of labor groups have held one-week schools that might be called single-purpose or single-subject schools. Some education directors feel that this type is more effective, particularly when it can be tied in with an action program back home in the local that will provide immediate use of the training. CWA, for example, used its school program in 1966 to back up its organizing efforts and trained local leaders that year in how to run organizing campaigns. The State, County, and Municipal Employees held 31 schools during the survey period to train local unionists in teaching techniques so they could run steward-training classes in their locals (for more details, see section on teacher-training). The IAM Secretary-Treasurer's department held nine schools during the survey period to train local union financial officers. A number of state AFL-CIO bodies also conduct single-purpose schools.

One of the older types of single-purpose schools is the Washington Legislative Institute, held during the survey period by the Rubber Workers and the Textile Workers Union of America. These institutes use the nation's capital as a dramatic setting for a school which teaches how our government works and provides background understanding of problems requiring legislative action. While many unions hold meetings and lobbying conferences in Washington, they are not included in this survey report because their main purpose is lobbying, while the URW and the TWUA institutes concentrate on an education program that will promote understanding of the union's political and legislative goals as a prelude to action back home. During the survey period, the URW held six Washington Institutes, with 300 attending; and TWUA had two schools, with 160 attending.

State AFL-CIO Schools

During 1966 there were 26 one-week schools sponsored by state central bodies, with 2,444 enrolled. Twelve different state bodies sponsored 22 schools for persons in their own states (California, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin). Four different groups of state bodies sponsored four schools which drew people from a total of 16 states (Gulf Coast Labor School, Arkansas-Oklahoma School, Tri-State Labor School, and Rocky Mountain Labor School).

State central bodies run schools for a number of reasons. Those schools that are sponsored by groups of state bodies occur in areas of the nation where the labor movement is not strong and where local unions turn to the state federation for help in many areas including education. Those in the south are an outgrowth of the Southern Labor School, which originally drew together the southern states from Texas to Virginia. Today the only southwide activity of the Southern Labor School is a school for staff (discussed in the staff-training section of the report), but from it have evolved the Tri-State School (the Carolinas and Virginia), the Gulf Coast Labor School (Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi), and the Florida AFL-CIO School. The Rocky Mountain Labor School, which is sponsored by eight state bodies, is the other "group" school that serves an area in which union membership is relatively scattered and small.

State schools also occur in states where the central body is concerned about education and conducts year-round education programs. Michigan, Texas, Indiana, and Ohio are examples. There are also several state schools, like those in Wisconsin or California, that are held largely because of the impetus from their respective university labor education centers, which provide facilities, staff, and administration for the programs and work closely with the state body in planning them.

Nine schools in seven states were conducted in cooperation with university labor education centers and held on campus. The other 16 schools sponsored by state bodies were held in resort facilities or at universities without labor education centers.

Teaching staff for the state schools comes from state and local labor staff, from the participating university if there is one, and from the national AFL-CIO, which also provides guidance and materials for some of them.

The program for most state one-week schools is the traditional one with a combination of tool or "skill" subjects and social issues. Such schools have a twofold purpose which dictates this program: to provide better understanding of those social and political issues that are particularly important in the state or area, and to give opportunity for basic leadership and skill training to those locals in the state which are isolated or have no strong national union education program to take part in.

There are also, however, a number of state schools with a "single purpose" or specialized program. Iowa has held schools on wage determination and labor law; Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania have community services schools; Ohio also held schools on workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation; and Texas in 1966 held four special schools: one for young trade unionists, one for women, one for young students, and one on labor law. A "general" school is also held in most years in these states. The specialized schools reflect both the particular emphasis of the state body and the desire to establish a school that will appeal to members of those national unions in the state having general schools.

Financing

How are these schools financed? Charges for board, room, and tuition generally range between $65 and $75, but may be as high as $100 in exceptional cases. In addition, the individual student is most likely compensated for lost wages, travel, and incidental expenses.

The sponsoring group, whether national union or state body, usually supplies teaching staff and some materials for the school, thus keeping tuition fees low. In addition, those universities with labor education centers often supply teachers and some materials at low cost.

In most cases the charges for the school are paid by the local union, which pays the board and room, lost wages, and travel expenses for its students. Thus the locals carry the major financial burden. However, four unions answering the survey questionnaire stated that the national union pays all or part of the board and room. In one union, the AFGE, the student usually absorbs the cost of lost wages by taking annual leave, and this occurs in individual cases from time to time in many other schools.

Facilities

Where are these schools held? At a variety of facilities--university campuses, commercial resorts, union camps and centers, YMCA lodges, hotels. Most education directors look for a site where the students can develop group morale by living, eating, and talking together.

Some education directors prefer to hold schools at universities with labor education centers and some avoid them when possible. Unions which conduct only two or three schools a year often select a campus with a labor education center because of the teaching and administrative facilities there. Some larger unions such as the Steelworkers like the educational atmosphere of the campus as well, and want to encourage their locals to use the center's services for year-round education activity. However, some unions which have set programs, and which also have enough teaching staff of their own, prefer to use other facilities where they feel that the school can be more closely identified with the union.

Table IV-10

ONE-WEEK RESIDENT SCHOOLS FOR LOCAL UNIONISTS
AT UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS, 1965 and 1966

Cooperating Organization	No. of Universities	No. of Schools	Enrollments
Single Union	18	114	7,801
Central Labor Union	7	19	1,614
Other Inter-Union	3	5	230
Totals	19 [1]	138	9,645

[1] Total indicates the number of different universities holding any such program.

Materials

Considerable attention is given to the preparation of materials for one-week schools. At most schools the students receive an especially prepared notebook containing facts and background information on the main subjects. This may be prepared by the union, the university labor education center if there is one, or--in the case of some state schools--by the AFL-CIO education department. In addition to the notebook, many pamphlets and paperback books are available at the schools.

These materials are designed as a reference for the student to use when he returns home as well as a source during the school session. This means that their use during school has to be carefully planned. Teaching staff, which varies for each school, has to be briefed and encouraged to use them if students are to become sufficiently familiar with the materials to turn to them for aid after they leave. The materials also serve another purpose in many cases: they furnish up-to-date information and teaching ideas for the education staff at other conferences and classes during the year.

Value?

Since one-week schools are such a major part of the labor education effort in the United States, the question is often asked: Are they worthwhile? What is the value of this kind of program? There are several answers, because these schools have more than one goal.

One of the main criteria by which the schools and other labor education programs are judged is the use to which the student puts his training when he returns home to his local. Does he take a more active part in the union after attending the school? Does he act more intelligently? This criterion is impossible to measure in statistical terms, but labor educators can cite numerous instances of students going on to greater and more discerning activity in the union after attending.

Students are often asked to evaluate the program at the end of the school week, and their comments are usually enthusiastic but relatively uncritical. This enthusiasm cannot be dismissed as meaningless, however, since it often boils down to increased motivation for union activity back home. Students who already have a position in their local may gain greater commitment and begin to widen their scope of work into fields like political action, which previously seemed unimportant to them. Students without much responsibility in their local may run for office or accept a committee assignment, although sometimes the local leadership does not want to or know how to use them. In these cases, follow-up by union education staff would be desirable, and this if often done casually.

On the whole, however, although "use" is an important criterion, follow-up is minimal. The individual is expected to find his own way to use his knowledge in union activity or, if he wishes to continue his education, to seek out labor education activities in his home community. When the school has one major purpose such as teacher-training or organizing, a certain amount of follow-up is built in because the local and the field staff have definite expectations for the returning students. For general schools, a few unions have mailing lists of their students and mail new pamphlets, education ideas, and current information to them during the year. Some universities also mail announcements of coming classes or conferences. The UAW has tried a home-study course for its students, but with comparatively little response.

Another goal of the one-week schools is to build morale and solidarity in the union, an important consideration for any institution that is founded on group endeavor. While most union conferences do this to some extent, the residential setting of the schools gives students an opportunity to get to know one another quickly while the education program focuses their concern on serious union matters beyond their own local.

This emphasis on morale and group solidarity is a key to the administrative decisions that many unions make when running schools. It determines the choice of facilities where students will be thrown together continually, the use of teaching staff that will spend time with students outside of class, and the encouragement of group recreational activities. It is one reason for the use of teaching methods that require participation and discussion. The group spirit fostered at a good school has an additional value, of course: it makes students feel at home and more receptive to new ideas.

Beyond the criteria of use and what might be loosely called union morale, the school programs also have a more traditional educational purpose: to increase knowledge and union skills. There is no objective measure of this criterion, since exams are almost never given at the schools because "use" is the aim. However, labor educators are continually pondering ways to improve the learning quality of the programs.

Students often complain that they get too much, too fast, on too many subjects, particularly at the general schools, and perhaps they are right. There is considerable variation in depth, quality, and teaching approach of the various courses and in the different schools, and educators sometimes question whether there is enough time scheduled for depth coverage of each subject and the necessary discussion to relate it to the students' background.

Integration is another education concern: helping students see the ties between various classes and the way the more academic subjects like economics or government relate to their union interests. This is particularly important when regular academic university professors or outside experts are used at a school, but the general nature of schools, where teaching staff is assembled for a week and then disperses, makes careful staff coordination necessary everywhere. The concern for integration is one of the reasons prompting some unions and some state bodies now to build schools around a theme. It has also led unions like the Auto Workers, the Clothing Workers, and the Communications Workers to the heavy use of union staff and even, in the case of the Rubber Workers, to the use of teaching teams throughout the various schools. Other unions prepare guides and briefings for outside teachers or hold several staff meetings during the course of the school.

Most of the union groups running schools would agree that the schools build commitment, increased understanding, and skills among the local union leadership. One-week schools have now become traditional, and thus are accepted without question in many unions, so there seems no doubt that they will continue. However, there is danger in routine, particularly for those unions and university labor educators who run numerous schools every year. Goals, methods, and educational quality need to be constantly re-evaluated, as in any educational enterprise.

Community Services Education

The community services activities of the trade union movement are based on two assumptions. The first is that trade unionists have problems outside the workplace and that the union has a responsibility for assisting in the solution of those problems. Some of these, such as adequate educational opportunity or a system of medical for the aged, become part of the union's legislative and political action programs. But there are many problems, particularly in health and welfare, that are resolved through voluntary action in communities, and the application to the individual of governmental programs like unemployment compensation is often a complicated matter.

The second assumption is that unionists as citizens are concerned with the quality and scope of services in a community and that the union provides an organized vehicle to focus and express this concern.

The great growth of the unions in the late 1930's coincided with two developments: increasing governmental responsibility in wide fields of social welfare; and an expansion in the activities of voluntary organizations dealing with health, welfare, recreation, and what might be called character building. The voluntary organizations were financed by fund-raising drives, either individually or through a community chest. Unions accepted the idea of supporting these traditional services rather than duplicating them. This attitude was reinforced when the United States became involved in the war and the unions supported fund raising for war-related voluntary activities. At the same time population shifts and other problems arising out of intensified war production created many community-oriented problems for workers. The American Federation of Labor established the Labor's League for Human Rights, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations created the CIO War Relief Committee (later the CIO Community Services Committee) to organize union support for the programs and assist in the solution of the special community problems that had arisen.

In 1942 these two organizations entered into an agreement with the United Community Funds and Councils of America for cooperation in fund raising, and in the interpretation of agency activities to unionists and of community needs as seen by the unions to the social agencies. As part of this agreement national labor staff were employed by the United Community Funds and Councils to work with both federations and to encourage the employment of local labor staff for the same general purposes in the community. The agreement was continued following the merger of the AFL and the CIO. As of August 1967 there was a labor staff of seven at United Community Funds and Councils, five at the American Red Cross, and 180 local labor staff representatives in about 100 cities.

The general purpose of the community services program is to stimulate the active participation by union members in the affairs of their communities and to develop sound relations between unions and social agencies. Specific responsibilities assigned to the program include the following: encourage equitable labor representation on social agency boards and committees; stimulate labor participation in formulating agency policies and programs; plan for union participation in such activities as disaster services and civilian defense; work with community groups in developing such health programs as blood banks; coordinate fund drives; develop programs for periods of strike and unemployment; stimulate the development of community programs in wide areas of social need; and develop educational programs for unionists around these functions. 1/

Community Services Organization

Since it deals with community rather than industrial problems, the AFL-CIO Community Services is administered as a federation activity. It is organized through the national AFL-CIO Department of Community Services and through the state and local AFL-CIO central bodies. 2/ At each level there is a community services committee which plans and coordinates. The specialized staff concentrations are national and local, although there are a few state central bodies which have a staff person who spends most of his time on community services. 3/ The local labor staffs have a joint responsibility to the employing community fund and the local central body to carry out the general purposes of the program.

It is generally accepted that his major activities should be determined by the central labor body. 4/

Since a major function of community services is to form a bridge between the worker with an out-of-shop problem and the best solution offered by the community, the program reaches into the local unions when possible through the establishment of local union community services committees, and by developing a volunteer activist, the union counselor, who attempts to identify the need and assist in finding help. The counselor is an active unionist who becomes familiar with community health and welfare resources and sees to it that his fellow workers who need help for themselves or their families are guided to the agency or agencies that can supply assistance. The work of the local union committees and union counselors is coordinated through the central labor body and the community services staff representative, where there is one.

Education and training have been functional parts of the community services program almost from the beginning. The first training institute for full-time national and local staff was held in 1942 at the Hudson Shore Labor School in New York State. Some form of staff training has continued since then, in most recent years in the form of regional training sessions for existing staff and orientation training on a national basis for new staff. When the union-counseling concepts were developed, it was quickly seen that while the active unionist might be able to learn about shop problems by living with them he could not serve as an effective referral agent without special training. It is in conjunction with union counseling that the most extensive community services education program has been developed.

There is an annual national conference, used for dealing with social problems, sharpening skills, and exploring special programs. Locally, there are special institutes and conferences that may study a wide range of social services or a single issue such as rehabilitation or mental health. In a few states there are one-week summer schools and statewide institutes.

In this report we shall attempt to review the various aspects of the educational activities conducted as a part of the community services program for both the national and community-sponsored efforts.

National Education Efforts

The national community services responsibilities related to education and training include programs for full-time local staff, the encouragement of local programs, the preparation of training guides for such programs, and the annual national conference. 5/

Training sessions for existing full-time staff are held every two years. They have consisted of seven regional three-day sessions, with groups of 10 to 20 staff members. The programs have varied in content in accordance with current concerns in the program, tending to explore both the content and the procedures for developing programs related to it in the local communities. Attendance is voluntary: that is, dependent on the decision of the staff representative and the local labor movement and community fund or council that employs him.

A series of training sessions was held in the winter of 1965-66 (another was held in 1967-68, too late for inclusion in this study). The major topic was the community services involvement in programs aimed at the elimination of poverty. Other sessions dealt with consumer problems and workers' use of leisure time. The labor staff representative in charge of training at Community Chests and Councils conducted the sessions, using specialized resources from government agencies, primarily the Office of Economic Opportunity, from concerned organizations, and from universities. The sessions were held on university campuses, mostly those without formal labor education programs. The total attendance was 75, about 55 percent of the then total local labor staff. This proportion was low compared with that of past experience when it was estimated that bout 80 percent of the staff participated.

The 1965-66 regional staff-training program was typical of most that have been held, combining information about a content area and suggestions for community services programs related to it. A few conferences in the past have been more concerned with what community services people call process training: that is, how to work effectively with people, or how to train. The national community services staff feel that the regional conferences have been successful with the local staff concerned with and involved in the program, but that they have not been successful in involving others in new kinds of programs.

In addition to the regional conferences, an annual three-day session is also held for new local labor staff, including replacements for existing staff and those in communities where labor staff is a new position (a total of about 10 a year). These sessions have been an intensive orientation about the history, purposes, and organization of community services and the responsibilities of the local labor staff. The material on which the sessions are based tends to be didactic, partly because of the effort to cover a great deal in a short time. Some time is allowed for discussion, but usually after a major presentation.

Education is also part of the purpose of the annual Community Services Conference, but the mixture of those attending makes this difficult. The 1967 conference held in May is a sample. The general topic was "Toward Improving Our Community Health Resources." There were four days of content sessions, with the mornings devoted to presentations on specific concerns, mostly by various well-known health professionals. Afternoons were spent in discussion related to the presentations, based on prepared discussion questions related to content and to the development of labor programs. About 400 registered for the conference. The largest group, 175, were from local union community services committees; 135 were full-time labor community services staff, local and national; 41 were from local central labor unions; 14 from state central labor unions; about 20 national unions were represented, and 35 were representatives of social agencies. The variations in experience were reflected in the difficulty of some of the discussion groups in coming to grips with the problems. For most of those attending, the conference seemed to be more "morale-building and horizon-widening" than educational in the formal sense of the word. In this it was not different from most annual conferences held by other organizations.

The national community services staff provides guides to help local staff carry out their educational responsibilities. 6/ These guides are simple and direct on the purposes and suggested content of the suggested program, and contain a heavy emphasis on administrative procedures. They tend to propose a standard pattern of formal presentation followed by questions and discussion as the educational method. As is indicated above, the local labor staff are not trained in educational method, so the nationally prepared guides become an important aid while the local staff representatives are gaining experience. There will be further comment on the impact of these guides in the discussion of local programs.

There are two community services programs for which a special national staff exists. One is the Red Cross, which has a labor liaison staff consisting of a representative at national headquarters and six regional representatives. The other is in the field of rehabilitation. There the program is spearheaded by the National Institutes on Rehabilitation and Health, which is financed mostly by grants from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Since education and training are important aspects of these programs, we have examined them separately. 7/

Red Cross

Two Red Cross programs are identified specifically as community services concerns in community services literature: blood-banking and disaster assistance. 8/ A third Red Cross program, first aid, comes within the general community services purposes and is of special concern to unionists as it relates to on-the-job accidents, particularly in the construction industry. Training programs have been developed in all three of these areas.

The blood-bank training concerns policy questions or administrative problems related to union involvement in Red Cross community blood banks. Sessions at two of the national community services conferences have dealt with this problem in recent years and, in 1964, one day of the regional training conferences was devoted to it. Occasionally there are local blood-bank institutes, but these are locally initiated and not reported nationally.

For many years unions have worked with the Red Cross by mobilizing assistance, particularly of skilled craftsmen, in disaster work. Three types of training have been developed to make such cooperation most effective. The most intensive is a one-week training program for construction craftsmen to prepare them to work as Red Cross staff during disasters. This was a new program in 1966, with six trainees. Red Cross paid the cost of training, including lost wages for the week. As a variation of this program 20 Omaha unionists took a two-day course to prepare them for disaster work.

A second program trains full-time local community services representatives to be Red Cross consultants during a disaster. This is a one-time program of four to six hours, conducted on a state basis in the disaster-prone areas of the country. Four such sessions were held in 1966, training 80.

During 1966 there were 20 union-member disaster workshops reaching 800. These were one-day sessions with local unionists describing the Red Cross responsibilities during a disaster and how unionists can help. Following such institutes, union members who assume specific emergency tasks are assigned to community-wide Red Cross training programs.

The involvement of unionists in Red Cross first-aid training developed quite differently. The Red Cross labor liaison staff recognized that first-aid training could become a component of the job safety concerns of the unions. It began as an effort to include first aid in the related training of apprentices. There was enthusiastic reception in a number of national unions and locals, which expanded the program to include journeymen. While it is difficult to get exact figures, the labor liaison staff estimates that 10,000 apprentices received basic first-aid training in 1966, and perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 journeymen. One result of this program was an acute shortage of adequate instructors, since the white-collar instructors, although successful with community groups, were not effective with construction workers. Local Red Cross chapters are encouraged to train instructors from the interested trades. Since the instructor training is conducted locally, there are no figures on how successful this has been.

These Red Cross programs may not be regarded as important for their educational content; yet they demonstrate how a community-based organization reaches out to a functional group to involve it in existing activity. This has been possible because the Red Cross specialized staff is familiar with both the labor movement and the Red Cross and because there is a channel through which to reach the unions: the community services program.

Rehabilitation

The National Institutes on Rehabilitation and Health Services was established in 1959, sponsored by the National Rehabilitation Association and the Group Health Association of America. Its primary concern has been to help establish a closer working relationship between the unions and the various public and private rehabilitation agencies. Union experiences in workmen's compensation, labor health programs, and community services activity had indicated that existing contacts were not bringing together the rehabilitation services and those who needed them; nor were they highlighting unmet needs so that existing programs could be expanded or new ones developed. From the beginning the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration assisted the agency with grants, some of which were directed specifically toward training. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has also supported local programs with the same general purpose, bringing unionists and rehabilitation agencies closer together and seeking avenues within the unions for case-finding and follow-up.

The educational activity of the NIRH is directed toward helping unionists understand rehabilitation, identify needs, understand referral, maintain contact during rehabilitation, and assist in return to work. The nature of the subject matter is such that the training must be broad enough to include information on other and related social programs: for example, workmen's compensation, social security, and the organization of health care.

The major educational activity of the NIRH has been a series of national and state conferences bringing together trade unionists, representatives of rehabilitation agencies and of labor health centers, and other concerned individuals. By the end of 1966 such conferences had been held in almost all the major industrial states, and NIRH was planning programs for major industrial cities and with major national unions. NIRH estimates that between 500 and 600 trade unionists attended the conferences held in 1966, most of which lasted two days.

NIRH also served as consultant in three local trade union rehabilitation programs financed by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration: one in conjunction with the labor education center at Rutgers University, the New Jersey Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Middlesex County AFL-CIO; the second sponsored by the New York City AFL-CIO; and the third, a statewide program sponsored by the Iowa State AFL-CIO. These local programs consisted of education that led to direct involvement of trade unionists in rehabilitation case-finding, referral, and follow-up. The New Jersey project trained newly established rehabilitation committees in local unions. The Iowa project was intended to demonstrate the feasibility of using highly trained union counselors to motivate severely disabled workers to accept rehabilitation, and to assist in referral and follow-up. The response in Iowa was such that it was necessary to expand the number of union counselors to relieve the pressure on already busy volunteers. In both these programs, and that in New York as well, it seemed clear that the previously existing machinery for case-finding and motivation was not reaching large numbers of disabled workers or members of their families who could be helped with existing rehabilitation services. The direct involvement of especially trained fellow unionists helped to overcome this gap.

Two conclusions that are relevant to labor education seem clear from the vocational rehabilitation activities of the NIRH and the other programs funded by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The first is that the traditionally available community-oriented services do not normally reach a large number of those whom they are intended to serve, but that, so far as unionists are concerned, this gap can be overcome with especially directed effort. The second conclusion is that this effort must be intensive, more than the spread of general information through the printed word or by general education. The general information may be necessary to arouse interest, but without the investment of considerable funds in training and support services by specialists these programs would not have accomplished their goals.

Local Community Services Education

In the listing of day-to-day responsibilities of the local labor staff representatives, the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services identifies the general education function quite clearly. The second point in the list reads as follows:

> "Develop union counselor training programs, health and welfare institutes, special educational programs, and tours of social agencies--all designed to meet the needs of union members." 9/

Later in the same document are listed some specific areas of community services education which are encouraged. In addition to the training of union counselors, these include health and welfare institutes on either the broad field or special areas, preretirement planning, consumer information, and strike assistance. The section on labor representation on community boards lists training of board members as a community services responsibility. 10/

Since education is so greatly stressed as a local community services function, we gathered information on the existing local community services educational programs, concentrating on those cities in which there are full-time labor staff. 11/ We attempted to identify the common kinds of classes and conferences, and to pay special attention to unusual programs. The following tables summarize the information by state.

During 1966 there was an enrollment of almost 19,000 in formal community services educational programs that were locally conducted: 12/ 11,125 in conferences and 7,556 in classes. These figures do not represent different trade unionists. As in all labor education, activists tend to participate in a wide variety of programs.

An analysis of the classes indicates, as one would expect, that union counseling is most common (see Table IV-12). As indicated earlier, the union-counselor program is predicated upon the training of local unionists to act as referral agents, bridging the gap between union members with out-of-plant problems and the resources that can help them. Knowledgeable community services staff estimate that there is a high turn-over of counselors. In a going program, therefore, the stream must be replenished. Only five labor-staff communities that conducted any educational activity failed to have union counseling classes in 1966. There were counseling courses in all five of the non-labor-staff cities reporting educational activity. In four of these it was the only activity. Twenty labor-staff cities reported counselor classes as their only educational activity, while in four others it was the only class held, the other programs being conferences. In those states supporting a statewide community-services staff, union counseling or training was reported in every labor-staff community except three, which have previously offered extensive training.

This universality of counselor-training is a reflection of its functional relationship to the community services program. Some

Table IV-11

COMMUNITY SERVICES LOCAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY, 1966

States (by region)	No. of Labor Staff Cities Reporting [1]	No. of Cities Reporting Education [2]	Total Classes		Total Conferences	
			No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment
Northeast						
Conn.	3	2	1	47	2	240
Mass.	7	5	9	625	8	975
R.I.	1	1	2	64	0	0
N.Y.	4	4	12	678	3	1,030
N.J.	4	5	6	210	5	656
Pa.	9	9	16	422	13	1,835
No. Central						
Ill.	5	6	26	722	3	165
Ind.	7	7	14	679	7	360
Mich.	10	10	24	845	14	1,822
Ohio	8	10	15	676	9	912
Iowa[3]	3	2	6	275	20	1,025
Minn.	3	3	19	470	3	377
Mo.	1	1	2	84	1	200
Wis.	3	3	12	405	3	203
Kans.	1	1	2	60	1	25
Nebr.	1	1	4	214	2	85
South						
D.C.	1	1	1	19	0	0
W.Va.	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ala.	2	2	3	81	6	177
Fla.	2	1	2	150	0	0
Ky.	1	1	6	159	6	530
La.	1	1	1	25	1	139
Tenn.	1	1	1	27	0	0
Tex.	1	1	1	30	0	0
West						
Ariz.	2	2	2	41	2	76
Cal.	3	3	4	252	2	48
Col.	2	2	2	79	1	75
Ore.	1	1	3	182	1	40
Utah	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wash.	2	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii		1	1	35	2	130
Totals	91	87	197	7,556	115	11,125

---

[1] Sixteen labor staff cities did not report.

[2] Includes five non-labor-staff cities.

[3] Iowa figures include 13 rehabilitation institutes with an enrollment of 225 reported by special rehabilitation project but not otherwise reported.

Table IV-12

COMMUNITY SERVICES LOCAL CLASSES, BY SUBJECT, 1966

States (by region)	No. of Cities Reporting Classes 1/	Basic Union Counseling		Consumer Problems		Related to Retirement		Other		Total	
		No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment
Northeast											
Conn.	1	1	47							1	47
Mass.	7	6	375	2	165	1	85			9	625
R.I.	1	1	42					1	22	2	64
N.Y.	4	8	476	1	80	2	100	1	22	12	678
N.J.	5	6	210							6	210
Pa.	9	9	286	1	15			6	121	16	422
No. Central											
Ill.	6	19	506	2	61			5	155	26	722
Ind.	7	9	465	2	126			3	88	14	679
Mich.	10	9	305	4	161	4	136	7	243	24	845
Ohio	10	11	537	2	64			2	75	15	676
Iowa	2	3	166	1	59	2	50			6	275
Minn.	3	6	125	5	109	2	105	6	131	19	470
Mo.	1	2	84							2	84
Wis.	3	7	284			1	65	4	56	12	405
Kans.	1	1	40	1	20					2	60
Nebr.	1	2	154	1	45			1	15	4	214
South											
D.C.	1	1	19							1	19
Ala.	2	3	81							3	81
Fla.	1			1	90			1	60	2	150
Ky.	1	1	45			3	84	2	30	6	159
La.	1	1	25							1	25
Tenn.	1	1	27							1	27
Tex.	1	1	30							1	30
West											
Ariz.	2	2	41							2	41
Cal.	2	2	170	1	30			1	52	4	252
Col.	2	2	79							2	79
Ore.	1	1	70	1	50			1	62	3	182
Hawaii	1	1	35							1	35
Totals	87	116	4,724	25	1,075	15	625	41	1,132	197	7,556

1/ Includes non-labor-staff cities.

observers of the local community service programs have said that the main activities are fund-raising and referral. The widespread union counseling makes referral meaningful in the local union.

There is a sharp drop in the number of communities conducting other classes, only 34 of the labor-staff cities reporting, and none of the five others. Only 11 communities reported programs for graduate union counselors. There were 20 cities with consumer courses, and 11 with courses for those retired or preparing for retirement.

The bulk of the union counseling classes ran for eight sessions, the length suggested in the national guide. A very few were less than that--six or seven. The others were longer, some meeting as many as 12 or 13 times. In the other courses there was much greater variation in length, most of them being shorter than eight sessions. A number of the programs for advanced union counselors consisted of monthly meetings organized as an educational program.

Fifty-seven labor-staff cities and Hawaii reported holding 100 community services conferences of some kind, most of them one day long but some for two and three days. The most common topic was medicare or social security, related to the newly passed amendments to the law. There were 34 conferences on this subject in 26 labor-staff cities. Next in number were conferences dealing with consumer problems, 13 of them held in 13 labor-staff cities. Eleven conferences related to the problems of poverty were held in seven communities.

As is true in labor education generally, the concentration of effort is found in trade unionists below the policy-making level. There was no report of special educational programs for central body community services committees. There were only two reports of programs for labor representatives on agency boards, a class in Columbus, Ohio, and a conference on agency budgets in Milwaukee. Materials for the Columbus class, attended by 50 students, indicate that it dealt with such subjects as labor's role in the community power structure and decision-making as well as methods of solving community problems. National community services staff indicated that there had been, over the years, considerable difficulty in recruiting labor representatives on agency boards for educational programs.

Two additional broader programs should be mentioned. One described as leadership and volunteer training has been in operation for a number of years in Milwaukee. This program is intended to increase the competence of a group of unionists who have committed themselves to continuing volunteer or program activity. The content includes community social problems and methods of effective functioning. All the 20 participants have had basic and advanced union counselor training previously. The group includes full-time union officials and those still working in the shop. Reports on the program indicate that it has made an impact on the development of the individuals, not on the general policies of the Milwaukee labor movement. 13/

An experimental program providing intensive training has been conducted by the Department of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University,

Table IV-13

COMMUNITY SERVICES LOCAL CONFERENCES, BY SUBJECT, 1966

States (by region)	No. of Cities Reporting Confs.	Health & Welfare		Consumer		Medicare & Soc. Sec.		Poverty		Other		Total	
		No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment
Northeast													
Conn.	2	1	100			1	140					2	240
Mass.	4	2	310					1	200	5	465	8	975
N.Y.	2	2	1,000							1	30	3	1,030
N.J.	3			1	250	2	213			2	193	5	656
Pa.	7	2	167	2	211	7	1,322			2	135	13	1,835
No. Central													
Ill.	1					2	90			1	75	3	165
Ind.	2			1	88			4	200	2	72	7	360
Mich.	7					8	691	1	102	5	1,029	14	1,822
Ohio	6			1	92	4	290	3	500	1	30	9	912
Iowa	2			1	150	4	400			15*	475*	20*	1,025*
Minn.	2			2	312	1	65					3	377
Mo.	1					1	200					1	200
Wis.	2			1	23	1	180			1	**	3	203
Kans.	1					1	25					1	25
Nebr.	1									2	85	2	85
South													
Ala.	1			1	18	1	32	1	27	3	100	6	177
Ky.	1							1	80	5	450	6	530
La.	1			1	139							1	139
West													
Ariz.	2			1	26					1	50	2	76
Cal.	1									2	48	2	48
Col.	1			1	75							1	75
Ore.	1					1	40					1	40
Hawaii	1									2	130	2	130
Totals	52	7	1,577	13	1,384	34	3,688	11	1,109	50	3,367	115	11,125

---

* These figures include 13 conferences with an enrollment of 225 conducted by the Iowa rehabilitation project and not otherwise reported.

** Enrollment figure not available.

supported by a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act, in cooperation with the community services labor staff in Reading and Harrisburg. The aim was to train 15 community labor specialists from each of these cities to analyze local community problems. There was emphasis on research method, particularly the development and use of the survey, with the view that the participants would be trained to supply the facts and opinions that would help the local labor movement take intelligent action. The student body was made up of trained union counselors. This experiment has been conducted too recently for us to determine whether it was completely successful. The university was sufficiently encouraged to decide to repeat it elsewhere in the state. 14/ Additional financing has been secured.

In a few cities local labor staff have developed a Citizens' Apprentice Program to acquaint high-school students with their community's social problems and the agencies that attempt to deal with them. The program, carried on with the cooperation of the schools and social agencies, consists of visits and discussions. The reports indicate that it has helped arouse a social concern among the students involved, created a suspicion of glib generalization about those who need help, and aided in the understanding of unionism.

The reports also reflect the development of educational activity, particularly conferences, in a specific topic as the result of intensified or special programs. For example, there were 14 rehabilitation conferences in Iowa during 1966, reaching 400, as a part of the special program in that state referred to earlier. Massachusetts reported conferences on juvenile delinquency, reflecting a University of Massachusetts project that had been funded by the federal government.

The reports were examined to see if any pattern could be noted in those communities that carried on a great variety of community services education. There were about a dozen of these, mostly medium-sized industrial cities with fairly strong unions. Only Chicago, of the very large cities reporting, had a major educational program. Three of the others were in states with state staff, each in a different state. Ten of the twelve were in the midwest. The national community services staff feel that the broad local programs reflect the interest and ability of the local staff representative and a responsive union movement.

We also examined the pattern of educational activity in the six states with statewide staff. Three of these have held well-attended, week-long resident schools or conferences for a number of years, and a fourth held its first statewide conference for four days in 1967. As already indicated, the local programs in all the states showed consistent union-counselor training. In three of the states there were social security and medicare conferences in most communities, accounting for slightly more than half the total number held on this subject and nearly two thirds of the attendance. Aside from this, the local programs showed the same character as those in the rest of the country, a few programs varying but most restricted to the areas already indicated.

Some indication of the educational methods used in the local classes is evident from the training meterials sent in, most of which dealt with union counseling. In general they follow the pattern suggested by the national training guide: fairly extensive presentation followed by questions. In but one instance was there anything intended to encourage or organize discussion. This was a series of cases, in a west coast city, used at the end of the course to test the understanding of the substance that had been presented. The staff representative involved reported that they had been very successful. As is suggested in the national guide, the presentations were made by representatives of the various agencies, public and private, each dealing with one type of program. It is common to have two presentations in a two-hour session. A great deal of substance is presented. There is also some use of role-playing to illustrate interviewing techniques, but this is often omitted because of limited time.

The material generally is in sharp contrast with that prepared for the board-membership sessions in Columbus, Ohio. The latter is organized to be a class tool, and forms the basis for small discussion groups around which much of the program is organized. Some of the conference programs indicate the formation of these small groups, and it is a common practice in the community services one-week schools. But, on the whole, local community services education is based upon presentation and questions, whatever the subject matter.

As the survey of community services education was being completed the program was undergoing a review out of which has come a plan to experiment with different approaches. Primarily the change in emphasis stems from a recognition of the importance of the educational role of the local staff representatives, and the responsibility for providing them with the training that will assist them in performing that role more effectively. There is hope that it may be possible, at least in some instances, to provide enough skill so that the local staff representative can become a trainer of trainers, developing a cadre of community services activists who can take over such programs as those for union counselors.

The emphasis on the educational process was the focus of the 1968 regional staff conferences. Labor education centers at the universities where the conferences were held were called upon to assist in this task. This will mark the first time that the expertise developed in other areas of labor education was broadly used in the community services training programs. Aside from the state schools and occasional cooperation on a local program, education sponsored by community services has tended to be self-contained and unrelated to the broad stream of labor education, whether conducted by the unions or by the university labor education centers. This applies even though union schools and conferences have often had sessions on community services, usually taught by community services staff representatives.

The gap between community services education and other labor education is reflected in the teaching method used and in the bulk of the training materials. In some ways steward training and union counselor training are parallel programs; each deals with the volunteer activist, trying to help make him more effective in a service to the union member. There have been developed a great many training materials for stewards, directly mainly toward student involvement in the learning process. A number of programs have been developed to use non-professionals as trainers of stewards. All of these are based on discussion and a wide variety of training aids intended to promote and organize student participation. There has been no similar development in counselor training. It may be that if a closer relationship is established the exchange will have an impact on the educational techniques used in community services. 15/

Each year the community services educational programs enroll about 19,000, making up an important part of union education in the United States. Community services concerns tend to stretch the interest of the participants beyond shop problems. Close observers of the program feel that it brings into union activity a somewhat different kind of unionist than is attracted to collective bargaining and other traditional activities. To the extent it does this, the program broadens the base of union participation as well as the perspective of unionists.

Footnotes

1/ Guidelines to the AFL-CIO Community Services Program (Washington, D.C., AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, 1966), pp. 1, 2.

2/ There are a very few national unions which have special national staff assigned to community services, in some cases full-time, in most, in conjunction with other activities.

3/ State AFL-CIO central bodies with full-time community services staff are Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois.

4/ Guidelines, pp. 7, 8.

5/ Information on the national program was gathered in a series of interviews with the director and members of the national staff of the Department of Community Services, by an examination of reports and materials, and by attendance at the annual conference.

6/ "How to Plan a Union Counseling Course"; "How to Plan a Community Services Institute"; "Consumer Counseling"; "Consumer Counseling, Education, Information for the Poor"; "Union Counseling and Referral Service to Meet the Needs of the Poor" (all AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, Washington, D.C., various dates).

7/ Information on the Red Cross programs was gathered in an interview with the Labor Liaison staff, American National Red Cross, from Red Cross pamphlets, and from community services material. Information on the National Institutes on Rehabilitation and Health was gathered from an interview with the NIRH director and from reports of conferences and other material.

Chapter IV Footnotes (cont'd)

8/ Guidelines, p. 1.

9/ Ibid., p. 7.

10/ Ibid., pp. 9-13.

11/ Information on local community services educational activity was collected through a questionnaire sent by the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services to all local labor staff and to selected AFL-CIO local central bodies where there was no local labor staff. The questionnaire sought information on programs conducted during 1966. This was the first attempt by the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services to collect information on local community services educational programs. There was a return of approximately 50 percent from the labor-staff cities from the first mailing, and a small scattering of returns from those communities without labor staff. The Department followed up with additional mailings to full-time staff who had not replied. The final tabulation represents returns from 91 of the 107 labor-staff cities and 5 responses from communities without labor staff. Information from two labor-staff cities (Houston, Texas, and Portland, Oregon) came from a questionnaire on the educational activities of major AFL-CIO local central bodies. Houston and Portland did not return the community services questionnaire.

The labor-staff cities from which there were no returns are: Atlanta; Baltimore; Charleston, W. Va.; Fall River and Lowell, Mass.; Gary, Indiana; Los Angeles; Nashville; New Castle, Pa.; Oakland and San Francisco; Seattle; Syracuse; Trenton, N.J.; and Tulsa. Those communities without labor staff that did report community services education are: Ashtabula and Canton, Ohio; East Alton, Ill.; Passaic, N.J.; and Hawaii.

The tabulations are therefore incomplete. They do not include the 16 labor-staff cities that did not report. There is some educational activity, particularly union-counselor training, in other communities without labor staff which did not report. The amount is not known.

In response to a suggestion, 13 local labor-staff representatives sent in training materials: 8 for union-counselor training; the others, varied.

12/ While reports were not received from every community conducting community services educational activity, the response was great enough to permit the use of the figures as approximating the total.

13/ Raymond S. McClelland, "Milwaukee Labor Develops Corps of Community Leaders," Community (January-February 1964), pp. 10-12; and interviews with Milwaukee trade unionists.

Chapter IV Footnotes (cont'd)

14/ "A Demonstration Program to Develop Labor Community Specialists," Department of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University (October 1967).

15/ After the section above was written three new training manuals were prepared by the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services. One, "The Basic Union Counselor Training Program," is a revision of the existing manual. The others, "The Local Union Retirement Counselor," and "Community Leadership Training Guide," are for new areas of training. The training methods suggested in all three manuals place a heavy emphasis on student involvement, making specific suggestions about the use of the techniques. This reflects a sharp break with past practice. It is too soon to know the impact of the new manuals on training methods.

CHAPTER V

UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS

There are 26 formally organized university labor education centers in the United States, or 27 if we include the special Brookings Institution program for elected national union officers. Three programs are new: those at The American University, Washington, D.C., and at the Edwardsville campus of Southern Illinois University getting under way in the fall of 1967; and the one at Virginia Polytechnic Institute just starting as this report is being completed. The others were all in operation during 1965 and 1966, the period which we surveyed.

Geographically the centers stretch from New England across the industrial northern section of the United States to Minnesota and Iowa, then jump to Colorado, California, and Hawaii. There is also a center at the University of Puerto Rico. The new one at Virginia Polytechnic is the first in the south, although the Trade and Industrial Education Service of the Alabama State Department of Education does sponsor activities similar to those at university centers in other states.

All but four centers are part of a state university: those at Roosevelt, Harvard, American, and Brookings are not. The state university group includes what is generally referred to as the Cornell center, which is part of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, a contract college of the state university, administered by Cornell. In all but three states there is only one state university center. The University of California has one each at UCLA and Berkeley. There are two centers at Michigan: one at Michigan State University; the other sponsored jointly by the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. Both of the Michigan centers have arrangements for joint sponsorship of programs with other state universities. With the establishment of the Southern Illinois University center at Edwardsville, there are now two in that state, the older at the University of Illinois. One private university center, Roosevelt, is also in Illinois.

Two centers that operated for some time are no longer functioning. The University of Chicago gave up its labor education activities in the early 60's. The University of Rhode Island had a program for a period after World War II that gradually came to a close in the 1950's. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale established a center in the 1950's but it has never conducted labor education as we use the term in this report.

All the existing centers are set up for the purpose of working with unions on labor education programs. Two of them have special functions: Harvard, a thirteen-week inter-union staff-training session; and Brookings, the conferences for elected national union officers. The others conduct varied educational activity on the university campuses, at special conference centers, or in the home communities of workers, primarily for local union activists. The programs include short courses, usually meeting once a week for a number of two- to three-hour sessions; integrated programs of part-time courses, referred to as long-term programs; full-time resident schools, traditionally one week long but sometimes longer; and a variety of conferences ranging in length from one to four days. A number of centers train full-time union staff. Some centers have developed programs with a special focus and often a special form, such as training for antipoverty projects or education in urban affairs. These programs generally are financed by grants from outside the university.

Nearly all the university labor education activity is developed cooperatively with a section of the union movement: a local union, a group of local unions, a national union, a state or local central labor body, or the national AFL-CIO. Some well-established centers initiate inter-union courses or conferences without a direct union involvement, but these make up a very small part of university labor education and do not affect the general pattern. The centers also have an over-all formal relationship with the unions, generally through an advisory committee to the program.

The programs of the university centers are the major community-based labor education in the United States. They afford educational opportunity to members of unions without national programs as well as those with; they make possible continuing education programs; they develop programs that bring together members of many national unions; they explore subject areas that may not be the immediate concern of either a national union or a central body; and at their best they bring a professionalism to labor education, offering the advantage of academic knowledge about problems of concern to unionists as workers and citizens of a society. They provide what public financial support there now exists for labor education.

In this chapter we shall describe the various activities of university labor education centers and shall attempt to identify trends and problems. We shall discuss the short courses, the conferences, the long-term programs, and the special programs. The university role in staff training and one-week resident schools for local activists has already been examined in the chapter on union education and will not be repeated. We shall also deal with some general issues such as relations with unions, labor education staff and staffing, and administrative structure, and shall touch briefly on current discussion among university labor educators about future trends.

In Table V-1 we provide a statistical account of all the activity conducted by labor education centers during 1965 and 1966. This includes figures for all the centers operating at that time except Puerto Rico, which is excluded for reasons indicated in the chapter on research method. The figures also include two programs conducted outside universities but which are similar to the university programs: that in Alabama mentioned above, and the labor education activities of the Division of School Extension of the School District of Philadelphia.

Table V-1

EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS 1/
1965 and 1966

Type of Program	No. of Universities with Educ. Programs	No. of Each Type	Enroll-ment
Short courses 2/	22	1,066	27,433
Long-term programs 2/	11	-- 3/	5,884
One-week resident schools 2/	18	138	9,645
Longer resident schools 2/	3	4	139
Conferences 2/	22	419	23,071
Staff training (all types)	14	48	2,021

1/ Includes programs conducted by the Trade and Industrial Education Service of the Alabama State Department of Education, and by the Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia. The Philadelphia figures cover a two-year period not exactly identical with the calendar years 1965 and 1966.

2/ Does not include programs for full-time union staff.

3/ Not available.

University Program Descriptions

To aid our analysis we have prepared program descriptions for the university centers in operation during 1965 and 1966. We have included Harvard and Brookings with their special-purpose programs. We have omitted Maine and Missouri because their centers had no directors and were in a period of transition during 1967. Both universities have employed new directors and the programs will continue. We do not include the three new centers established in 1967 and 1968: at The American University in Washington, D.C.; at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; and at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. All of these have begun with small programs, the first two with part-time staff. The initial programs have been traditional, greater emphasis on staff training being given by American University than would be usual in a new program.

We have included program descriptions for three other institutions because their work is similar or relates to the work of the university centers. They are the Alabama and Philadelphia programs mentioned earlier and the National Institute of Labor Education, a joint union-university venture. They are the final programs described, the others preceding in alphabetical order.

For the state university program descriptions we have noted the number of unionists in the state in 1965 as given in a U.S. Department of Labor press release dated January 19, 1966. At the end of each description we have indicated the size of the institution's staff in 1967, where possible separating the full-time from the regular part-time staff and indicating the number working on special projects. We have classified the director as full time even though he may have responsibilities in addition to labor education, and we have also classified as full time those who occasionally teach an academic course.

The Brookings Institution

In 1963 The Brookings Institution Advanced Study Program held the first of its Public Issues Conferences for Elected Union Officials. Brookings has long conducted special educational programs for leaders in business and government. The program for unionists is an effort to make available to top union policymakers the knowledge of scholars and specialists about current public issues. It is the only inter-union educational program for elected officers of national unions.

The Brookings program is directed by an experienced labor educator, now working part time, under the guidance of an advisory committee of seven presidents and secretaries-treasurers of major national unions. The committee functions actively in the development of topics for discussion, and in recruitment.

The sessions, three-and-a-half days long, are held at an isolated conference center in Williamsburg, Virginia. While the topics deal with important social questions, they are not related to immediate union problems or to controversial issues within the union movement. Economic problems have been considered at a number of conferences; other topics have included the urban crisis, the impact of science on the society, pressures on U.S. democracy, and the role of the union movement.

There has been no difficulty in attracting outstanding academic and other experts for the presentations. Background readings on each topic are provided to the participants. The sessions are completely off the record, with no publicity given either to the presentations or the discussion.

There are now two Brookings conferences a year: one for national union presidents and secretaries-treasurers, and the other for vice presidents and regional directors. Attendance is about 15 at each conference. A constant recruiting effort is required. Since the program started, 91 union officers from 29 different unions have attended. About half of the unions represented have their own internal education programs; the others do not. One result of the conferences has been to bring together under very favorable conditions top union officials who do not meet in their normal trade union work. One union, the United Steelworkers of America, has adopted the Brookings format for special conferences of its executive board, and others are now considering similar action.

University of California. California union membership, 1965: 1,888,000

There are two labor education centers at the University of California, one at Berkeley and the other in Los Angeles. Each program is part of the Institute of Industrial Relations on its campus, and each is based in a Center for Labor Research and Education.

A statewide Joint Labor-University Advisory Committee guides both programs. This committee is made up of labor representatives and representatives of the two institutes and the two labor education centers. The Joint Committee was set up in 1963 when the state AFL-CIO requested more research and education services from the university. The Committee formulated a set of "Guidelines for Expansion of Labor Programs," which laid out directing policies for the two programs. Since then, the Berkeley program, which had previously carried on little labor education, has begun to provide considerable educational service and has expanded its research into areas of direct concern to California unions. The UCLA program, which had been conducting labor education programs since 1948, has expanded staff somewhat. Both Centers have a research program, and while these programs differ both are union-oriented rather than industrial-relations-oriented.

The Berkeley program serves the northern part of the state, while the UCLA program serves the southern area (with Bakersfield the dividing point). Thus each program works with one large metropolitan area (San Francisco, Los Angeles), and each also serves the unionists in smaller cities and rural towns.

The Centers work together and exchange staff on such programs as the annual state AFL-CIO one-week school and the activities of the California Council on Health Plan Alternatives, a group of unions interested in the quality and cost of insured health services. There were four regional educational conferences to acquaint local union leaders with health benefit problems leading to the formation of the Council, and the university centers provide research on request.

On the whole each center concentrates on its own area and its own program.

Berkeley

The Center for Labor Research and Education at the University of California, Berkeley, began to expand both labor education and research services in 1965, in line with the new "Guidelines" developed by the University and the California AFL-CIO. As a result, figures for the two-year period covered by this survey do not present a complete picture of the Center's activities, since many programs did not get under way until 1966. Of the union membership in the northern part of the state, approximately two thirds is in the San Francisco Bay Area and about one third is in outlying towns and cities.

Educational services of CLRE include a Labor Studies program; short courses for officers and stewards; summer schools; and conferences on a range of current issues. In addition, the Center is trying to tie together its labor research and educational activities in a way that will make both more meaningful to the labor movement.

The Labor Studies program offers courses in eight areas outside San Francisco proper. A person who completes five courses in the program receives a certificate. The courses run for 8 to 10 weeks, providing basic teaching in such subjects as economics, labor history, grievance handling and arbitration, and communications. In 1966, 21 courses in this program drew 519 registrants. Since there had previously been few labor education programs in a number of these communities, the Labor Studies program is filling an old need, and about one third of its registrants are full-time officials and business agents. The courses are sponsored by the central labor bodies, which are responsible for the recruiting.

The Center also runs numerous programs for officer and steward training, in individual locals or unions. Eleven such training courses drew 278 in 1965-66; 33 conferences had an enrollment of 1,357. Bargaining, grievance handling, and union administration are the main subjects. Most of this type of educational activity with individual unions is carried on in the Bay Area, although a few on-campus programs draw from outlying areas.

During this period the Center also ran seven one-week schools, with 310 enrolled. Two of the schools were held jointly with UCLA for the California Federation of Labor.

In the conferences and programs sponsored by central labor bodies issues of broad concern to labor are usually the subject. Many of these programs are planned for and draw staff and full-time officials. Eleven conferences with an enrollment of 473, and three seminars enrolling 70, dealt with issues such as low-income housing, the war on poverty, health plans, area unemployment patterns, and similar subjects which demand new knowledge on the part of labor leadership. Several programs were educational sessions for the California Labor Press Association, which wanted to improve both the members' techniques and their knowledge of issues.

Several of the conferences and seminars planned by the Center grew out of its research activities and its attempts to translate research into action. The Center sees as one of its functions the provision of technical backing for labor groups on industry or community problems. Its research is initiated by union request and focuses on practical problems facing a union group. For example, the Center is now working on a study of the changing job and employment pattern of the carpenter in the home construction industry, and as this research proceeds educational conferences with carpenter leadership keep them informed of the results so they can use these facts in formulating programs on bargaining and apprenticeship.

Research and technical services are also used to put together information that central labor bodies need to deal effectively with community problems and the new federal grant programs. Several of the Center conferences and seminars have been set up to bring the findings of such studies to labor leadership in the locality concerned.

There are three persons on the Berkeley labor education staff.

Los Angeles

The University of California's labor education center in Los Angeles dates back to 1948, although its title and structure have recently been changed. Most labor education programs were based in the Institute of Industrial Relations, but some courses were conducted by the UCLA extension division. The two programs have now been combined in the Institute's Center for Labor Research and Education.

The CLRE holds conferences and institutes jointly with unions, conducts summer schools, has a Labor Studies program, and provides technical and educational help to area unions on several community programs. While it is concerned mainly with labor education, the Center works with others in the Institute on labor-management programs occasionally, and also cooperates in programs set up for community agencies and groups.

The Labor Studies program, which is cosponsored by the Los Angeles Central Labor Council and concentrated in the Los Angeles area, was administered until recently through University Extension, working in cooperation with the Institute. The program requires eight 20-hour courses for a certificate. Unionists choose courses from four groups, but there are five required courses: labor history, economics, human behavior, government, and reading and writing skills. In 1965 and 1966, 37 courses were given under this program, with 602 persons registered. Most classes are inter-union, although from time to time a class is set up at the request of one union group. Since all short courses offered by CLRE are set up under this program, a large number of registrants take only one course.

While the Labor Studies program sets up classes which draw from many unions, the Center also works with individual unions in its summer school and conference program. In the two years of this study, 10 summer schools were held, with an enrollment of 795. In addition, the Center cooperated with the Berkeley Center on two summer schools for the state AFL-CIO.

Shorter conferences with individual unions drew about 1,600 during 1965 and 1966. These ranged from the traditional one-day steward and officer training program to three-day resident staff training programs for such regional union groups as the Teamsters and the Carpenters.

Many of these traditional labor education programs are based on long continuing relationships between members of the Center's staff and individual unions in the area. The Center, for example, has always had an interest in the development of union health insurance programs, and continues to run special educational programs in the health and welfare field.

The Center makes its resources available to union groups wishing to become involved in some of the newer programs where labor reaches into the community. Research is often helpful in this way, as well as the Center's knowledge of technical resources in the university and the community. The Center helped the Teamsters set up a new federally financed manpower training program and is now helping them with a week's course for the trainees on labor, unionism, and workers' rights. Similarly, the Center has provided technical aid and leadership training sessions for the Watts Labor Council, a group of labor people working in the Watts area of Los Angeles. Programs for senior citizens and for the Mexican-American community are also part of the Center's interest in helping labor broaden its community involvement.

For the past three years, the Center has had a labor intern each year, selected from local union applicants, and paid a yearly salary. The intern decides on his own interests and activities, since the aim is to help an individual develop his own capabilities so that he can better serve the union movement in the future. Thus far, interns have returned to the labor movement but not always to their own union. The labor education staff consists of three full-time and two part-time persons.

University of Colorado. Colorado union membership, 1965: 124,000

The Center for Labor Education and Research (CLEAR) at the University of Colorado was started in 1962 and since 1967 has been a separate unit of the university, responsible to the academic Vice President, with guidance from both a faculty committee and a labor advisory committee. During the first five years of the program it was part of the Department of Economics. Its function is the provision of labor education services, teaching credit courses in the university, and labor research.

The program includes classes, conferences, and week-long schools in cooperation with individual unions and central labor bodies. Most of these programs are held in the area east of the Rockies, since well over half the state's population and nearly 80 percent of its union members are concentrated there. However, CLEAR has made an effort to work with all the eight central labor bodies in the state, mainly using weekend conferences in the outlying areas to the west and southeast of the state.

In Denver, where over half of the state's unionists are located, the Center has set up a regular program of classes known as the Denver Area Labor School and sponsored by the Denver Area Labor Federation in cooperation with the Colorado AFL-CIO Labor Council. Inter-union short courses, about ten each year, are given in three terms, during the fall, winter, and spring. Response to this program is indicated by the fact that the 1967 fall term drew 121 to the school's four classes.

A similar but smaller program of regular classes is now being planned with the central labor body of Colorado Springs.

Classes and short conferences are also conducted for local unions and individual union groups. In the period covered by the survey questionnaire, the Center conducted a total of 25 classes, reaching 663. Of these, 14 classes were held in cooperation with local central bodies (including Denver), and 11 were sponsored by various unions. During this same period, six one- or two-day conferences were held, with an enrollment of 412 (three conferences with the Denver central labor union and three with individual unions). The Center also plans and cosponsors conferences occasionally with the state AFL-CIO.

Five week-long programs, with 316 enrolled, were held on campus in 1965 and 1966 (two for Steelworkers; one for staff of the Retail Clerks; one for AFL-CIO Women's Auxiliaries; and one for the Rocky Mountain Labor School, an eight-state group of AFL-CIO state bodies).

Most of the teaching in these labor education programs is done by staff of the Center. Center staff also teach from four to six credit courses a year on the Boulder and Denver campuses of the university, making a special effort to attract union members to them. Although these courses do not draw a large number (40 in 1966-67 in 4 courses), about 25 percent of the students are union members.

CLEAR has two full-time staff and one part-time.

University of Connecticut. Connecticut union membership, 1965: 244,000

The University of Connecticut Labor Education Center is the oldest continuing university labor education program in New England, having been established shortly after World War II during a period of rapid expansion for the university. It was originally part of a Labor Management Institute, but in 1961 the program was transferred to the Division of Continuing Education. Its position was strengthened in 1964 by the report of a review committee appointed by the university's president. The committee included representatives of the labor movement, the university faculty and administration, and the president of a neighboring university who had been dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

As a result of the report, the program was expanded, a research arm was added to the Center, and the charges to unions for extension classes were sharply reduced. Up to that time the charges had been expected to meet all direct costs of the classes: that is, instructional cost, travel, and other expenses. The Center now subsidizes half of these costs.

Consequently there has been a marked increase in the number of extension classes taught in the home communities of the unionists: from 21 courses reaching 521 in the 1964-65 academic year to 55 courses enrolling 1,254 in 1966-67. The length of the courses has increased during the same period. About half the classes are conducted in cooperation with local central labor bodies, and there is a conscious effort to provide education service throughout the state by this means. The others are classes sponsored by individual local unions. Teaching is done primarily by members of the Center staff, but some part-time teachers are used. Some of the increase in activity stems from the growing interest in education by unions of government workers, federal, state, and local--both the AFL-CIO affiliates and the independent associations that have become more "union"-oriented as a result of the growth of the AFL-CIO unions and the passage of a state collective bargaining law for public employees. In recent years there has also been an increase in classes for unions in the construction industry; these now amount to about 15 percent of the total program.

Basic trade unionism has been the subject matter for most of the classes, whether the course is sponsored by a single local union or by a central labor union. Some of the central labor union classes have dealt with critical social problems such as urban affairs. The Center regards its courses in trade union skills and understanding as basic to the program while supplementing them with broader subjects and more sophisticated courses in the social sciences.

While the extension courses are its major effort, the Center also conducts conferences on campus and throughout the state, and works with national unions on one-week schools. There has been a decrease in the number of such schools as unions that formerly sponsored them have stopped and others have begun to rotate their week-long schools among the university labor education programs now functioning in New England. There were three summer schools in 1967, as contrasted with eight, ten years ago. There is a labor education staff of four, full time.

Cornell. New York State union membership, 1965: 2,507,000

The labor education program of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations is the only center associated with a university unit that is set up exclusively for undergraduate, graduate, and extension education, research, and publications in labor-management relations. The School is a contract college of the State University of New York, administered by Cornell, established by an act of the New York State legislature. Extension programs with management and unions were mandated by the legislature, and the labor education activities are administered through the School's extension division, headquartered on the campus, with district offices in New York City for the metropolitan area, in Buffalo and Albany, and at the School in Ithaca.

The director of extension and the director of each district office has responsibility for both union and management education; there is no separate statewide structure for unions as is the case in other universities with labor-management units. There are labor extension specialists in the large staff in New York City, and recently a labor extension specialist has been functioning upstate to provide leadership in union programming. A number of special programs, operating from headquarters, work with both unions and management. In the early days of the program the joint extension activity was an issue with unions, but this is no longer the case.

Because of the special nature of the School, the legislature provided for labor representation on its governing board. These unionists are concerned with the total operation, not specifically with extension. While there is a labor advisory committee for labor extension, the chief contact with unions has been through programs, and the School has developed support over the years from those unionists with whom it has worked.

The extension division of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations sees its function as meeting the educational needs of its "publics," one of which is the unionist. The program has been financed more adequately than others. The result has been a large union program of great variety, ranging from numerous tool courses to experimental classes that have run a full year, some of which were credit courses. There is a conscious effort to provide programs throughout the state, based in part on the extension district offices but reaching beyond them to isolated communities when a need is discovered. In the two-year period covered by our survey, the School ran 221 extension classes with an enrollment of 5,156. There were also 35 conferences enrolling 1,850. Almost all the classes and conferences were developed with a single local union or several locals of the same union. There were a few with local central labor unions, and 36 classes that were School-sponsored, all in New York City. There were only three union summer schools, in part because of the isolation of the campus and the lack of facilities. The major part of the program was in the New York City metropolitan area.

The metropolitan area illustrates best the variety of activities. There are many traditional tool subjects offered, particularly in programs with new unions or unions to which education is new. Some 600 taxi drivers were trained while the union was being built. Broad programs covering many subjects were conducted with unions that had long-established educational activity. There were several classes for full-time union staff, both in individual unions and from several unions. In many instances unionists were trained as instructors for their own unions. New developments in the behavioral sciences were applied to collective bargaining and union administration. Attention was paid to labor and the arts, including a conference with the New York City central labor union. An intensive program was developed around the problems of the metropolitan area. The School sponsored courses with open enrollment, some of which were intended to improve skills while others dealt with basic social problems, such as civil rights.

The School uses a wide variety of part-time teachers, supplementing a small staff of content specialists who are either employed full time in the extension division or appointed jointly for the resident faculty and extension. The content specialist has become more important throughout the state as the program has gained sophistication. There has been an attempt to upgrade the part-time teachers by providing extensive handbooks of teaching materials.

Unionists were also involved in the nine School-sponsored labor-management conferences, usually held around some topic of current concern. These conferences were in addition to those held as part of the special programs in public employment and education described below.

The School has developed several special programs to deal with specific problems or issues. Funds from a grant under Title of the Higher Education Act started an urban affairs project in metropolitan New York. This project is now being continued with a grant from The Ford Foundation supplemented by union contributions. It will include a variety of courses and seminars, special publications, and an intern program.

Two projects deal with the problems of collective bargaining in public employment. These operate with special staff, who work with both management and unions, statewide. One, financed at the beginning by the state education department, deals with employer-employee relations in the public schools. The other, originally financed by a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act, deals with employer-employee relations in the public service generally. The original activities in both programs were essentially informational, consisting of a series of labor-management conferences throughout the state. A shift has now been made to more specialized training, with programs developed in cooperation with specific organizations in the more traditional fashion. It is expected that this work will continue as a permanent activity.

A special program for training unionists as instructors has also focused primarily on the public employee organizations and has been extended to management. Described as "line-by-line" training, this program is based on the development of carefully prepared materials to apply to a particular situation. Intensive training prepares unionists to teach from these materials. There is observation and criticism. Originally the Cornell activity involved the New York state postal unions only; there is now a national project with American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and there have been programs with Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Workers, New York City; the United Federation of Teachers, New York City; locals of the Building Service Employees International Union and the Communications Workers; and District 9 of UAW. The AFSCME project involves the training of the union education staff to become trainers of union members as instructors. There are no complete records of the number of unionists who have attended classes conducted by graduates of this program. A partial report covering all of 1965 and half of 1966 totals about 600 for Local 1199, The Building Service Employees, CWA, UAW, and the United Federation of Teachers.

Statewide the Cornell labor education staff consists of eight full time and three part time. In addition, there are two full time in the urban affairs project and five in the projects dealing with public employment. The latter work with both unions and management.

Harvard

The Harvard Trade Union Program provides 13 weeks of intensive training for union staff. Each class is made up of 15 to 20 U.S. unionists and 6 to 9 foreign trade unionists. During some terms there is a small group of U.S. State Department foreign service officers training to be labor attachés.

When the program was originally established in 1947 it provided for nine months of training. This was curtailed to 13 weeks in the fall of 1948. Since the fall of 1951 there have been two groups each academic year.

The program has its offices at Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration but operates independently under a faculty council representing the Business School, the Law School, the School of Government, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. A trade union advisory committee includes national officers of unions that have participated in the program and some national officers of other unions. The committee meets once a year to review the program, giving attention to content and method as well as to support.

The content stresses practical training and related background information. Course titles for 1967-68 were Problems in Labor Relations; Economic Analysis; Labor Law; Arbitration; Trade Union Administration; Wage Administration and Benefit Programs; American Labor History; International Labor Affairs; Trade Union Communication; and a Collective Bargaining Seminar addressed by prominent representatives of unions, management, and government.

The largest part of the faculty is made up of Harvard professors, including many nationally prominent scholars. Faculty from other universities and industrial relations practitioners are used for some courses.

The basic system of instruction is the case method, involving discussion. The cases are highly sophisticated descriptions of total problems; their use helps train the students to analyze the problems. The use of the case method ensures that the students prepare their assignments and understand the material, and serves as an incentive to informal discussion before and after class. Each instructor prepares his own cases and readings. There are 25 class-hours a week. About one sixth of the total program takes place in classes held jointly with students in Harvard's various management programs and with graduate students in economics.

Most of the American students are sent by their national unions. Generally they are staff men advancing in their careers, with eight to ten years of union experience. The average age is 36 or 37. There are some scholarship programs for local unionists or representatives of state AFL-CIO central bodies.

The Harvard Trade Union Program tends to draw students from the same unions repeatedly over the years and, largely but not entirely, from unions that have not developed internal education programs for local union leadership or staff. Some unions have participated almost from the inception of the program (Railway Clerks, Maintenance of Way Employees, Boot and Shoe Workers, Operating Engineers, and Iron Workers); some that did participate earlier stopped when national leadership changed or for some other reason. Recently the number of participating unions has increased. Those that do send students seem to be not as much concerned with education as a union instrument as with the development of a few staff members of high competence. This would account for the willingness to meet the high cost of staff time and support that is involved in a 13-week program.

The director is the only full-time staff member of the program.

University of Hawaii. Hawaii union membership, 1965: 50,000

The Labor-Management Education Program at the University of Hawaii began in 1965 under the aegis of the Industrial Relations Center and the College of General Studies of the university. It is responsible for programs for labor, management, and public groups, although thus far the emphasis has been on labor programs.

The Program is working with a labor movement equally divided between AFL-CIO unions and unaffiliated groups, of which the largest is the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union many of whose members are agricultural workers on the outlying islands. The main unions, except the ILWU, are represented on the advisory committee.

Thus far the Program has worked largely with unionists on Oahu, which comprises the city of Honolulu. Classes got under way in 1965 with courses for local unions and for the Oahu central labor body in basic tool subjects. During the 1965-66 survey period, nine courses of this nature were conducted with 101 enrolled. Since then, the program has been growing, so that in the spring of 1968 eight courses were offered on an inter-union basis in the city of Honolulu. Among these courses were two directed specifically to public employees, a general emphasis because of the large number of federal and state workers in the Honolulu area.

The Program has also included several different kinds of educational sessions dealing with community affairs. During the survey period, a three-day conference on Labor's Stake in Hawaii was held with the Hawaii Federation of Labor, with 100 enrolled. More recently, there were eight seminars on issues related to the 1968 revision of the State Constitution.

In addition, two courses on community agencies and community problems have been conducted with funds from Title I of the Higher Education Act. One of these was a community services course and the other dealt with broad problems like civil rights and public transportation.

Aided by the Title I grant, the Program has prepared and published teaching manuals on Labor History, Union Administration, Public Speaking, The Union and the Community, and How to Write the History of Your Local Union. These manuals, which are intended for general use in labor education, combine content reading for the students with teaching aids at the end of each chapter: questions, suggested books, pamphlets, and audio-visual aids.

The staff consists of two full-time and one part-time member.

University of Illinois. Illinois union membership, 1965: 1,394,000

The labor education program at the University of Illinois is part of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations (ILIR). The ILIR was set up in 1947 to provide extension services for labor and management, to do research, and to carry on a graduate degree program in the field of labor relations. In the twenty years since its inception, the labor program has developed established relationships with many Illinois union groups who have come to expect programs that are carefully planned and taught. Since the university is located near the center of the state, the labor program has traditionally worked throughout downstate Illinois and has not concentrated in Chicago.

The labor programs are promoted, planned, and taught largely by ILIR labor education specialists who are on joint academic appointment with the Division of University Extension. Rules on fees and class size are those set by the university for all extension programs; and expenses for travel, rooms, and ad hoc teachers come from the budget allocated by the university to the Division of University Extension. Income from labor extension courses goes into general university funds and is not available for use in the labor program.

Short courses, conferences, and summer schools are held for unions and central bodies in the state. In the two-year period covered by the survey, 56 short courses were held, with 1,219 attending. Of these courses, 36 were sponsored by individual unions or locals, and 20 by central labor bodies. The classes, and many of the conferences, emphasize training in grievance handling, bargaining, communications, and similar subjects. ILIR feels that such bread-and-butter service programs are important not only for themselves but because they provide the base for interesting union groups in programs on broader issues.

During the survey period, the program conducted 11 resident conferences at university facilities, and 15 conferences in the home communities of students. These were from one to three days' duration. Fourteen of the conferences were sponsored by single unions; 10 were for central bodies; and 2 were annual conferences sponsored by the Illinois State AFL-CIO. A total of 965 enrolled in the sessions, which ranged in topic from steward training to current community and political issues.

In 1965 and 1966 there were 15 summer schools for local union leadership and one staff-training program held at university facilities. These week-long schools drew 1,015. They were sponsored by various unions. The Steelworkers hold three each year with ILIR.

In 1965, a field office was set up in Chicago, and there are now two labor education staff there. Although ILIR has always run some classes in the Chicago area, this office will provide closer contacts with Chicago unionists, who make up more than half of the state's total union membership. As a result of this change, a long-term program was begun in Chicago in 1967. This Labor Studies program provides a series of related 12-week classes, and a person wishing to get a certificate must take six classes, chosen from five categories. Since the Labor Studies program is just getting under way, it is difficult to determine its future.

The ILIR labor staff is now urging some of these groups with which it works to adopt a program approach to education over a period of time, rather than simply to request an occasional isolated class. Two statewide IBEW locals have set up programs for a series of campus conferences for chief stewards which take up several different subjects each year.

The six labor education specialists on the staff do most of the teaching of off-campus classes and conferences. Other faculty from ILIR and the university are used in conferences and schools dealing with specialized subjects.

The Institute has a tripartite advisory committee with representatives from management, labor, and the public. This committee meets occasionally to discuss on-going activities and new programs of the Institute as a whole. Recently a 15-man labor advisory committee was set up in Chicago to give support and guidance for labor programs in the metropolitan area.

Indiana University. Indiana union membership, 1965: 522,000

The Labor Education and Research Center at Indiana University is part of the Division of University Extension. In addition to the traditional short courses and conferences, the Center has a long-term Union Leadership Program and, for three years ending in 1966, conducted a unique 12-week resident program for union members in cooperation with the Steelworkers.

The Center's staff work from the Bloomington campus of the university. Since union membership in Indiana is heaviest in the northern part of the state, this location presents some problems and union groups in the center of the state seem to draw more heavily on the Center for local programs in their home communities than those in the populous northern tier.

During 1965 and 1966, the Center conducted 35 short courses enrolling 837, many of them in steward training. Of these, 27 courses were sponsored by individual unions and many were part of a UAW program to train leaders in new local unions. Eight of the 35 short courses were sponsored by central bodies. A number of those conducted for individual unions were tied to a Center program to train local union leaders to teach steward training, a plan which they hope will provide skilled teachers of this subject throughout the state and free the Center staff for other subjects.

During this same period, the Center conducted 19 short conferences: eight on campus, and eleven off campus. Seven of these were one day long; the others were two to three days; and for the most part they dealt with bargaining, grievances, and union administration. There were 660 in the resident conferences, and 587 in those off campus. All were conducted jointly with individual unions.

Most of the Indiana programs are sponsored by individual unions in the state, particularly the Steelworkers and the UAW--the two largest unions--during the survey period. The Steelworkers helped develop the program at Indiana and have always been heavy users of its services. For example, 11 of the 19 conferences noted above were sponsored by the Steelworkers' district in the southern part of the state, and 2 of the 5 summer schools were for this same district.

With central labor bodies, the Center is concentrating on the Union Leadership Program, begun in 1963. Indiana's ULP is pragmatic, offering courses in Bargaining, Labor Law, Communications, and Shop Psychology, in addition to a course in government and one in economics. A student must take five out of six courses, each 15 sessions long, in order to receive a certificate. During the survey period, the ULP enrolled 550 students in four cities under the sponsorship of local central labor unions.

While the Union Leadership Program has operated in four different cities since it began, its classes were being held in only two cities at the beginning of 1968. This decline is attributed by the Center to staff vacancies and consequent recruiting problems. The Center intends to spread the program to eight cities eventually but, since most of these are not large, the program may run for a period in a city and terminate until interest builds up again.

During the survey period, the Center held the last of three 12-week experimental resident programs for members of the Steelworkers, financed by the union, the university, and a substantial grant from The Ford Foundation. This program, called the Resident Labor Education Program, brought small groups of Steelworkers to the campus for 12 weeks to take especially designed courses in the social sciences and the liberal arts. Steelworkers' members, not staff, were eligible to apply, and those selected received board, room, tuition, and a weekly maintenance stipend in lieu of wages. While the original plan had been to open registration for the third program to other unions, this did not work out, and the 1966 program had 18 Steelworker students from four districts.

As part of this program, the Center conducts two-day conferences each year for its graduates. These conferences, held on campus, deal with broad subjects such as Latin American affairs or morality in American society.

Among its other projects the Indiana Center has developed a 10-session correspondence course in Labor Journalism. Publicity about the course brought 115 registrants from the United States and Canada in early 1965 and over a year later 32 persons had completed it. A workshop for the enrollees was held on campus in 1965 and drew 20 participants. This course, while overseen by Center personnel, is now administered by the university's Bureau of Correspondence Study.

There is a Center staff of five, full time. These staff members teach in all the various programs from time to time. The Center also uses a number of part-time teachers throughout the state as well as university faculty in its on-campus programs. The Center's budget comes from the Division of University Extension, and thus university funds provide money for ad hoc teachers.

University of Iowa. Iowa union membership, 1965: 150,000

At the University of Iowa, labor education programs have been carried on since 1957 by the Center for Labor and Management, which is a part of the College of Business Administration. The Center provides educational services to management, public and government groups, as well as labor, with specialized staff serving each group.

During the two-year survey period, the labor education program conducted 16 short courses, with 849 students enrolled. Of these, eight were for local unions and eight for inter-union groups, sponsored largely by central labor bodies. These courses dealt with grievance handling, union administration, bargaining, labor law, labor history, and similar basic subjects.

In the Center's labor education program the emphasis has always been on such bread-and-butter subjects, but in the fall of 1967 the Center initiated a new long-term program called the Union Leadership Academy, which stresses social issues. This program is financed largely by a Title I grant and aims to make union leadership more aware of community problems as well as more effective in their unions. There are six required courses, to be taken over a three-year period: Institutional Conflicts in Society, Social Legislation and the Labor Movement, Effective Union Leadership, Our Economy and the Labor Movement, Communicative Skills, and Problems of the Affluent Society. Special teaching materials have been prepared for several of these courses under the Title I grant. Classes are being held on the campuses of four of the new Iowa community colleges.

The Center also holds a number of one-week schools each year. During the survey period there were eight such schools with 378 enrolled. Five of these were sponsored by the state AFL-CIO and three by individual unions.

The state AFL-CIO schools are a continuing activity with the Center each year. There is usually a general school, including both advanced and basic sections. In addition, a specialized Labor Law Institute and concurrent schools on time study and job evaluation are run yearly. This program is designed to provide a variety of education for locals in the state, ranging from basic training for the isolated locals to more advanced subjects for others.

During the survey period the Center also held 10 conferences ranging from one to three days in length. Of the five resident conferences held on campus, four were sponsored by individual unions and one was held in conjunction with the Midwest Labor Press Association. Five conferences, all one-day, were held in various outlying communities (two sponsored by individual unions and three by central labor unions). Total enrollment for all 10 conferences was 482.

As an outgrowth of its interest in industrial engineering, in 1967 the Center joined with the AFL-CIO in sponsoring the first school on Testing Practices in Industry, a one-week program for union staff.

There are three, full time, on the Center's labor education staff.

University of Massachusetts. Massachusetts union membership, 1965: 572,000

The labor education activity of the University of Massachusetts is one function of a Labor Relations and Research Center established by the university in 1965. Up to that time Massachusetts had been the major industrial state without a state-supported university labor education center. The situation might have continued had not the university awarded an honorary degree to the president of the AFL-CIO, George Meany, who called attention to this lack in a speech made on that occasion. The state AFL-CIO and the university followed up Mr. Meany's remarks by cooperation on the establishment of the Center, the university using the opportunity to strengthen its on-campus offerings and research in the field as well as to inaugurate a labor extension program.

In addition to its educational work with unions, the Center is involved in graduate education, sponsoring a program leading to a Master of Science in Labor Studies. It also conducts its own research and supports academic research. It reports directly to the university administration, since it is not part of a school or a department. While the headquarters of the Center are at the main campus in Amherst, one assistant director for extension has his office in Boston because the majority of Massachusetts unionists are in the eastern end of the state. The Center is one of the very few labor education centers that equate union experience with academic training in hiring extension staff. Two of three staff members who work on extension programs are without college degrees.

The extension program has emphasized continuing classes in basic union subjects conducted primarily for individual local unions, and short conferences dealing with similar subject matter for groups of locals from the same national union. There have also been several one-week schools on the campus for regions of national unions. There has been little work so far with local central labor unions or directly with the State AFL-CIO. The beginning of the program coincided with the growing interest in education of unions in public employment, and there has been an increasing demand from these, both those affiliated with the AFL-CIO and the independents. In the first 15 months of the program, ending January 1, 1967, there were 16 short courses with 533 enrolled; 15 conferences with about 1,300; and five one-week schools attended by 375. Preliminary reports for 1967 show an increase in all these categories.

The Center has conducted two special programs financed by U.S. Government grants. The first of these was a project on Trade Unions and Juvenile Delinquency funded by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency. Originally this was a one-year program; then it was extended for another six months. It was an effort to develop an understanding of juvenile delinquency among unionists and to establish relationships that would enable unions to work with the agencies dealing with the problem. The project, conducted in cooperation with the State AFL-CIO Community Services Committee and local community services representatives, consisted of a statewide conference followed by local conferences and workshops.

Trade Unions and Poverty in New England, the second program, is a one-year project that began in May 1967. Financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is intended to train 150 New England trade unionists for effective work on the problems of poverty in their communities. It is a cooperative effort of the six New England State AFL-CIO's and the national AFL-CIO, and is the second of such regional projects funded by the OEO, the first being the Appalachian Trade Union Training Program conducted by West Virginia University. The project is a combination of training and supervised community activity by the unionists, involving the local central labor unions and community action agencies.

The Center has a labor education staff of four; the Juvenile Delinquency and OEO projects, four each; all full time.

Michigan State University and University of Michigan-Wayne State University.

Michigan union membership, 1965: 962,000

Michigan is the only state in which there are two major independent state-university-supported labor education centers. The oldest of these, established in 1956, is the Labor Program Service of Michigan State University's School of Labor and Industrial Relations. This program was organized on a formal basis following some experimentation in labor education by the MSU extension division. In 1957 the University of Michigan and Wayne State University set up the second program, a Division of Labor Education and Services in a jointly sponsored Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. Wayne State had had a small labor program as part of an institute of industrial relations. The University of Michigan had sponsored a major labor education program in the middle 1940's, but that had been abolished by the Board of Regents following criticism by the auto industry.

There are also two major union educational programs in the state: that of the UAW, which has its headquarters and the heaviest concentration of members in Michigan; and that of the Michigan AFL-CIO.

Each of these four programs is conducted independently and relates to all the others. The state AFL-CIO sponsors major programs with the two university centers and also conducts some programs with the UAW. The 1968 expulsion of the UAW from the AFL-CIO will change this. In general, the two university programs operate independently with a rough but not absolute geographic division. In the past the university centers cooperated in a number of statewide conferences and other programs, but more recently this cooperation has taken place in a continuing series of teacher-training sessions that have prepared unionists to teach in the university extension programs.

The massive UAW membership in Michigan, combined with an aggressive education program, has caused the universities to ration their resources so that they would not be absorbed by a single union but would relate to the union's work. The universities cooperate with both the UAW education department and the UAW Studies Center, which is responsible for staff training.

Michigan State University

The Michigan State University Labor Program Service is a part of the School for Labor and Industrial Relations, which includes as well management and government extension programs, a manpower program, research, and graduate education. Formerly located in the extension division, the School is now academically based in the university's College of Social Science.

The provision of labor education opportunity throughout the state is a major concern of the MSU Labor Program Service. When the program was first established in 1956 an introductory series of conferences was held in cooperation with local central labor unions. These conferences were followed by classes sponsored by local unions or central labor unions, for the most part taught by staff from East Lansing where MSU is located. More recently, cooperative cost-sharing relations have been established with two other state universities: Oakland in Pontiac, and Western Michigan in Kalamazoo. Thus the staff has been decentralized, one staff member being located at each university to work with the unions in that general area. The decentralization makes possible more effective program development with the unions and the discovery of instructional resources.

The short courses conducted by the Labor Program Service are now about equally divided between those sponsored by local unions and those sponsored by central labor unions, the latter drawing a somewhat larger attendance. In the two-year period covered by our survey, attendance totaled about 2,500 for the 88 such classes that were held. As in other universities, there has been an increasing participation by government employee unions.

In 1966 the Labor Program Service developed a Program in Labor Studies leading to a certificate for those who complete six ten-week courses, most of which are in the social sciences but including reading improvement and communications skills. The Program in Labor Studies is now offered in nine centers in the state, sponsored jointly by the Michigan State AFL-CIO and the local central labor unions. More than 400 were enrolled in this program in 1967.

The MSU Labor Program Service hosts a State AFL-CIO summer school annually, and conducts summer schools for other unions occasionally. There is special attention to staff training, and the university has been used by the Allied Industrial Workers, the International Association of Machinists, the American Federation of Government Employees, the United Auto Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and the AFL-CIO for programs for full-time staff. During the survey period there was a special conference for trade union members of state vocational education advisory boards conducted jointly with the AFL-CIO and funded by a grant from the Office of Education.

There are two programs directed toward increasing the labor education resources in the state. Trade unionists are trained as instructors in steward training and related fields. Successful trainees are used in the university program. Labor education interns have spent a year as part of the program staff before returning to the labor movement. It is hoped to expand this part of the program and put it on a regular basis. The labor education staff consists of six full time, in addition to the intern.

University of Michigan - Wayne State University

The labor education program of the University of Michigan and Wayne State University is a division of the jointly supported Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. The universities are in the heavily industrialized southeastern corner of the state, and the establishment of a joint institute was an effort to use the resources of both in program development rather than in competition. In addition to labor education, the Institute has divisions for management education, research, and manpower development. It is governed by an executive board consisting of equal numbers of representatives of both institutions; there are codirectors based in the two universities, and institute offices at both. Individual members of the Institute staff are attached to the university at which they are located.

The staff of the Division of Labor Education and Services is divided between the two offices, with the director at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and the others at Wayne State in Detroit.

The Institute has joined with Northern Michigan University, at Marquette, in supporting a labor education specialist based at the latter university for work in Michigan's upper peninsula.

The program of the Division of Labor Education and Services consists of a wide variety of part-time classes for unionists in southeastern Michigan, primarily in Wayne County, and specialized resident programs, usually in Ann Arbor, developed with education departments of national unions. Over the years the evening classes have shifted from those sponsored by individual unions to inter-union classes in cooperation with local central labor unions. Almost three quarters of the 130 short courses conducted during the period of the survey were sponsored by central labor unions, and these attracted about two thirds of the 3,100 who enrolled. These totals include 16 short courses enrolling 320 in the Northern Michigan program. The short courses developed with the central labor unions are organized into a Workers' Basic Study Program which includes a combination of six- and eight-week courses in tools and background subjects, taught primarily by part-time instructors but with some teaching by members of the staff. The number of classes and the enrollment in them have both grown since the Workers' Basic Study Program was first established. Special sessions have been organized for night-shift workers.

The Institute has also developed a two-year, tightly organized Labor School, leading to a certificate. The major program is offered in Detroit but a second unit has been started in Ann Arbor. Admission is limited to those who have demonstrated an interest in education by participating in the Basic Study Program or other labor education activity, or who hold leadership positions in their unions. Participants commit themselves for the full program, which consists of 30 sessions each academic year and two conferences. There are eight units, primarily in the social sciences, with the final one a labor problems seminar based on student research. About 300 participated in this program during the period covered by this study.

Residential programs conducted by the Institute have been essentially for full-time staff. There have been one-week schools for the regional education staffs of two unions, and special sessions with the UAW staff-training center. The Institute has also conducted the 12-week academic section of the Communications Workers of America training program for new staff.

In the early period of the antipoverty program, the Office of Economic Opportunity funded an experimental community action program in one section of Washtenaw County through the Division of Labor Education and Services, intended to relate labor education techniques to community action training.

The labor education staff consists of six, including the representative at Northern Michigan University.

University of Minnesota. Minnesota union membership, 1965: 339,000

The Labor Education Service (LES) of the University of Minnesota is part of the Industrial Relations Center and the General Extension Division of the university. Its budget comes from these two sources and from a special grant from the state legislature. In addition to labor education the staff is expected to do labor research and to teach some regular academic courses in the field of industrial relations.

Roughly 70 percent of the union membership in Minnesota lives in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, where LES is located. To serve unionists in the northern part of the state, LES has one staff person in Duluth who works from the University of Minnesota campus there.

In the programs for the Twin Cities and Duluth areas, LES puts considerable emphasis on the Union Leadership Academy (ULA), a long-term program. To reach outlying communities, one- and two-day conferences are held. In addition, its staff conduct a few short courses and a number of statewide programs for individual union groups.

During the two years covered by the survey, LES held 37 conferences, enrolling 1,166. Of these conferences, 25 were one-day programs sponsored by central labor bodies in their home communities. Their sessions were designed to develop interest in community participation and leadership in the central labor union.

Short courses during the survey period totaled 12, all of them sponsored by individual unions. These courses enrolled 310. There were also four one-week resident schools, one of them a staff-training program for the AFGE and three of them the traditional summer schools for the Steelworkers and the CWA. These four schools drew 230.

The Union Leadership Academy program during the survey period enrolled 370. Most of these were in the Twin Cities where the program was started in 1963 and has concentrated since, although it is now offered in two smaller cities and in Duluth. The ULA consists of eight courses; a person completing seven of the eight receives a certificate. These courses are labor law and history, economics, union administration, human side of union leadership, logic and problem solving, communications, national and world issues, and fine arts. Each course is 12 sessions.

One of the goals of the ULA is to build a group of well-informed leaders in an area who know one another and who are interested in labor education. The Labor Education Services uses a newsletter and occasional social events to promote camaraderie, and also tries to use the same faculty in a city from year to year so that the unions there come to identify them with the program. The LES staff teach a number of the classes and recruit outside faculty who will commit themselves to the program for several years. This faculty comes from the university, from junior colleges, and from independent professionals like lawyers and AFT members.

In the Twin Cities, LES started a "feeder" program in 1967. This was set up in part because ULA enrollment declined and in part because, while the ULA program is aimed at officers and business agents primarily, a number of stewards were attending and this caused too wide a spread in experience in the ULA classes. The new Basic Labor School gives courses in tool subjects like bargaining, steward training, and running union meetings. Those who take two of these courses can use them as part of the requirements for a ULA certificate.

Two programs connected with the antipoverty program have also occupied LES. In the last half of 1966, the Minneapolis AFL-CIO Council and LES cosponsored a training program for VISTA workers. There were 94 VISTA's in two six-week training sessions. The nature of the program made it difficult for the VISTA workers to see much of unionism and vice versa; so, while it was quite successful from the VISTA point of view, LES has made no attempt to continue it.

LES is also working on an Employment Opportunities Program in conjunction with a labor committee representing a variety of unions in the Twin Cities. This program is financed by a grant from HEW, and its aim is to get minority group members and disadvantaged persons into jobs and trades. Union volunteers work with these individuals to provide counseling and support, while the labor leaders on the committee help find jobs and training opportunities.

There are four persons on the Labor Education Service staff, one of whom works on community projects.

Ohio State University. Ohio union membership, 1965: 1,148,000

The Labor Education and Research Service (LERS) of Ohio State University has two major functions: (1) to make available university-level continuing education for workers and their organizations; and (2) to conduct programs of labor research and materials development. The LERS is now part of the Division of Continuing Extension of the College of Administrative Science.

While the LERS conducts traditional labor education programs, most of its staff time and effort is devoted to the Union Leadership Program (ULP), a four-year, long-term program. The ULP was started in 1959 as a conscious effort to provide a different kind of education for union members, a more academic education for individual development rather than education to help them in their organizational roles in the union. While the course structure has changed several times since 1959, the ULP remains more academically focused and taught than most other such long-term programs. At present, participants take one subject field each year for four years in the labor sector, social sector, political sector, and human sector. In each, there are 24 class sessions held over a period of nine months in the school year.

During the two-year period of our survey, the ULP operated in as many as 16 cities with a total enrollment of 1,004. In 1967-68 the number of cities was cut to nine and the opening enrollment in the fall of 1967 was down to 321 (as compared to 515 in 1965-66; and 409 in 1966-67). The LERS has found that there is not sufficient interest in the smaller cities to sustain the program without more extensive promotion than the staff can do. A good deal of LERS staff time is spent administering the Union Leadership Program; consequently most of the courses are taught by faculty from Ohio State University and from local colleges throughout the state.

Completion rate for the enrollees in 1966-67 was 80 percent, which means that 80 percent of those who enrolled in September attended three fourths of the classes during that year. The big dropout of students seems to occur particularly between the first and second years of the program.

The Labor Education and Research Service also provides labor education services to unions and central bodies that request them, but it does not promote this service. In the two-year period of the survey, eight short courses enrolling 304 were given under the sponsorship of two local unions and six central bodies. The courses were in basic subjects such as steward training and public speaking.

Additionally there were 15 nonresident conferences (one to four days) held in 1965 and 1966, drawing 1,686 participants. Fourteen conferences were for individual unions; one was with a central labor union. For the most part they dealt with tool subjects. Three summer schools held on campus drew 179. One school was for the Steelworkers and two were for time study and job evaluation for the Glass and Ceramic Workers.

Fees charged by the Ohio State program are high compared to those for labor education services at other universities. The LERS budget comes from the college to which it is attached, and ultimately from the university funds, and there is no subsidy for labor education except support of the staff. Programs must be largely self-financing (travel, instructors, materials) and so fees are high both for the ULP ($60 per year per person) and for short courses or other programs requested by unions.

The Labor Education and Research Service has a staff of five.

Pennsylvania State University. Pennsylvania union membership, 1965: 1,450,000

The Department of Labor Studies at Penn State University is responsible for the labor education program in the state as well as for undergraduate instruction on campus and research activities. The Department is part of the College of Liberal Arts. It relies on the Continuing Education Service for administrative and clerical services for its labor education programs but control and planning of all programs lie with the Department. Its labor education program provides services both on and off campus for workers. It is not responsible for service to management groups.

Since Pennsylvania is a large state, the program maintains field offices with full-time representatives to work with local labor groups. Field representatives have been assigned to eastern, central, and western Pennsylvania in recent years, and a fourth representatives is being added. The field representatives are essentially education administrators. Occasionally they teach at classes or conferences, but their main job is to set up programs throughout the state on request from local unions, regional union groups, and central labor bodies. In recent years a little more than half such programs have been sponsored by central labor bodies. In 1965 and 1966 there were 27 short courses: 8 sponsored by individual unions; 19 by central labor bodies. Of 13 conferences in this period 9 were sponsored by individual unions and 4 by central labor bodies.

Most of these programs deal with tool subjects such as steward and officer training, collective bargaining, time study, and public speaking. They are taught by local teachers--professors from local colleges, schoolteachers, and government officials, supplemented when necessary by Department staff and Penn State faculty.

Also reaching into the home communities of unionists is the Union Leadership Academy, which Penn State conducts in cooperation with the labor programs at Rutgers in New Jersey and the University of West Virginia. This program provides a total of seven courses, usually over a four-year period, in social science subjects such as labor history, economics, union administration, labor and government. The ULA program functions in nine Pennsylvania urban areas at present, and since almost all the classes are sponsored by county or city central labor groups, the students come from a variety of unions.

The ULA program has been quite successful in Pennsylvania, with growing attendance since it started in 1961, and the Department has put considerable emphasis on it. In 1965 and 1966 the Department held 33 ULA classes with an enrollment of 1,256. This compares with the 40 other short courses and conferences conducted off campus in this period, which drew a total attendance of 1,654.

In addition to these off-campus programs, Penn State holds programs on campus, most of them summer schools with international unions and the state AFL-CIO. Eighteen summer schools were held during the two years of this study (five with the Pennsylvania State AFL-CIO; four with various internationals; and nine with the Steelworkers Union which has its national headquarters and a large membership in the state). Attendance at these summer schools during the two years was 1,140.

Fees for off-campus instruction have been high compared to many other universities with similar labor programs. Late in 1966 these fees were cut considerably, and this has already resulted in a substantial jump both in ULA courses and in other programs requested by unions and central labor bodies. However, many unions in Philadelphia use the labor education services available through the adult education program of the Philadelphia School District, in part because of convenience and in part because they are much cheaper. As a result, most programs in Philadelphia are not run by Penn State.

The Department of Labor Studies has experimented with several special programs in recent years. In 1965 and 1966 they conducted a program, financed with vocational education funds, to equip local unionists to teach steward training in local school evening classes. Another program, financed with funds from Title I of the Higher Education Act, experimented with ways to train labor community specialists in Reading and Harrisburg. They are also cooperating with the Pennsylvania State AFL-CIO Community Services program, in a special OEO-supported program which will explore ways in which labor can make its influence contribute to local antipoverty programs.

Several research activities of the Department have been concerned with labor education. A study of the age and educational background of participants in all Pennsylvania State labor programs is nearing completion. In progress is an evaluation of participation in the Union Leadership Academy program in the Lehigh Valley, which aims to find out what effect participation in ULA classes has on the citizenship activities of the students. It will compare a group who attended and graduated from the ULA program with a similar group of unionists who did not take part in ULA.

The labor education staff consists of five full time and four part time. Some of this staff worked on the teacher training and labor community specialist programs, and were replaced by six part-time staff. There is a staff of two in the poverty project, one full time and one part time.

Roosevelt University

Roosevelt University is the only private institution of higher education that, during the period of our survey, sponsored a labor education program similar in size and character to those conducted by the state universities. The program dates back to the beginning of the school, and is a natural result of the trade union support for Roosevelt over the years combined with the university's desire to deal with the educational needs of the total Chicago population. The Division of Labor Education began in 1946, one year after the university was established. It is a separate school, its director serving on the administrative council of the university.

Roosevelt programs conducted in cooperation with unions are concentrated in the Chicago metropolitan area. In recent years the Division has sought to meet the educational needs of local unions with short courses and conferences of a practical nature. In the two years included in this study, 55 short courses were conducted, nearly all of them for individual local unions, enrolling 900. Most of these courses are taught by part-time teachers, some of whom are unionists who have been trained as instructors by the university.

In 1962 the Division started a Long-Term Leadership Program that now provides for four years of education, primarily in the social sciences but including science and the humanities. The program has a set curriculum and at the end of each year awards a certificate showing the extent of the program completed. Class sessions are three hours each; there are 32 sessions a year. Readings are an important part of the work. This program has made use of selected feature films as the basis for discussion of class issues and ideas. Registration amounts to about 150 a year for all sections.

Films are also important in the short courses, and the Division maintains an active film library that is used by unions as well as in the classes. One film that has been produced, entitled "How to Win Elections," is widely used in labor education. There have also been several books published directed to use in labor education: most recently one entitled "Union Representative," by two members of the staff; and another entitled "Influence of Science on Humanity," based on the science unit in the four-year program.

Roosevelt University is closely involved in the continuing staff-training programs of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, and has conducted staff training for other unions as well.

The Labor Education Division was the sponsor of The Chicago Area Plan for Workers' Mental Health, a project financed by a four-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. While the primary function of the project was the treatment of workers' mental health problems within the framework of a Labor Health Center, one aspect involved the development of short courses in this subject conducted for a number of unions.

There is a labor education staff of three full time and one part time.

Rutgers. New Jersey union membership, 1965: 814,000

The labor education center at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, is one of the first to be established in the post World War II period. It is part of an Institute of Management and Labor Relations, established by the New Jersey legislature, located in the university extension division. A recent reorganization of that division has also placed the Labor Program in the Bureau of Instruction and Research, with funds still coming to it from the Institute.

Union support was an important factor in the establishment of the Institute, and the New Jersey unionists have been close to the center. Trade union contributions made possible the construction of the Rutgers Labor Education Center on the campus, and a Labor Alumni Association maintains a continuing tie with the unions in the state.

Ad hoc programs, serving the educational needs of individual unions, made up the bulk of the Rutgers activity in its early years. More recently there has been some shift away from these toward programs aimed at the development of individual unionists.

The service concept is maintained in the 56 short courses conducted in 1965 and 1966 and enrolling 1,208; in the 11 summer schools attended by 600 in the same period; in brief teacher-training programs for a few unions; and in the work with the New Jersey Labor Press Council.

Rutgers was the founding university for the Union Leadership Academy, a long-term evening program with open registration, consisting of seven courses; six courses are eight sessions long and the final course is 16 sessions. The program concentrates on unionism and the social sciences as they relate to workers' problems. (Penn State University and West Virginia University are now operating the program jointly with Rutgers.) Requiring extensive readings, it is more advanced than traditional ad hoc courses. ULA courses are conducted in three state centers, 120 students having enrolled in the two-year period. There has also been an attempt to establish a more advanced Certificate in Labor Studies, offering semester-length courses on unionism and the social sciences, but this was not in operation during the period of our survey.

Related to these efforts has been the initiative taken by the Labor Program in establishing a Department of Labor Studies in the Rutgers evening college, which offers a major for a B.A. The Department is not part of the Labor Program but closely related to it. The first courses were offered in the fall of 1967. It is hoped that the labor studies major will provide a meaningful program to trade unionists who wish to continue their formal education and that it will enrich the total college curriculum as well.

There have been several special programs, based on internship, for the development of individuals. The Labor Program has occasionally provided a labor education intern position for the training of trade unionists as educators. In cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, the Labor Program administers a nine-week program during which the trade unionist trainees spend four days a week participating in labor department activities and the fifth day in class. There have been four of these groups, with 35 participants.

A much more ambitious program, financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided for the training of trade unionists and civil rights activists from the poverty population for full-time jobs in community action. Two groups of 20 each received a combination of on-the-job and classroom training for one year. The third and fourth groups were 40 each in six-month programs. All who were trained have been placed in jobs with community agencies or unions. Another activity related to the antipoverty effort has involved the training of a group of unionists to develop community action programs and train participants for them.

The Rutgers Labor Program also administered a special three-year program financed by a grant from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration directed toward the education of unionists in this field and the development of the union as a vehicle for case-finding and follow-up. The sponsoring group included the unions and the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission. A second grant has been received to expand the project and place it on a joint labor-management basis.

The Labor Program has a staff of three for labor education, two in the Vocational Rehabilitation Project and three in the Community Action Training programs.

West Virginia University. West Virginia union membership, 1965: 192,000

Probably more than any other university labor education center the West Virginia University Institute for Labor Studies can be regarded as the educational arm of the AFL-CIO state central body. This is reflected in the Institute's close relations with the West Virginia Labor Federation, which determines the thrust and character of the continuing and special programs. A constant consultation between the Institute and the labor federation has led to education activity which concentrates on cooperation with local central bodies supplemented by state conferences and a one-week school.

This relationship provides a character to the primary regular off-campus program, the Union Leadership Academy, that is somewhat different from the one in the universities with which the Institute cooperates in ULA--Penn State and Rutgers. With continuing programs in eight different cities, the West Virginia ULA is widely spread through the unionized areas of the state and is administered locally in each case by the central labor union's education committee. In most instances the ULA followed courses on the effective functioning of a central labor union. In ULA communities participants in this program made up 90 percent of those who attended a series of courses on state and community problems. These latter programs were financed by funds from Title I of the Higher Education Act and are described later.

The West Virginia University Institute drew 856 registrants to its extension classes during our survey period, 1965 and 1966. Of these, 605 attended ULA classes while 196 were in other central labor union classes. There were only two short courses sponsored by individual unions. The largest single union in the state, The United Mine Workers, has shown no interest in education.

Conferences sponsored by the state or the local central bodies also attract most of the participants in these activities, both on and off the campus. More than two thirds of the 1,700 attending conferences in 1965-66 came to those held by central bodies. One group of over 300 attended a three-day manpower conference for the Appalachian Trade Union Council (the Council is made up of the state AFL-CIO central bodies in the Appalachian area and is headed by the president of the West Virginia Labor Federation). The individual conferences included a number for unions in the construction industry, in a special effort to reach those unionists.

Each summer the Institute holds a one-week school in cooperation with the Labor Federation, focusing the program to provide variety for those who return over a four-year period. There was also a school for the West Virginia members of one national union during our survey period. The three schools drew 160.

A Title I grant, now about $30,000 annually, has made it possible for the Institute to develop a series of short courses, offered throughout the state and dealing with state problems. Classes in this program have been held in ten communities. Special materials provide a text for each of the courses. The first of the series dealt with the operation of state and local government; the second, governmental problems in West Virginia, including reorganization, constitutional revision, and taxes. Courses in majority-minority group relations and foreign affairs are now being planned. There was also a course in community planning for one city.

A major effort of the Institute has been the Leadership Training for Community Action, financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity and conducted in cooperation with the Appalachian Trade Union Council. A 1966 grant provided for the training of 100 unionists from the Appalachian area to prepare them for more effective involvement in antipoverty programs. The program offered one month of resident training for the participants, divided into one-week units. The training was interspersed with practical experience in community programs through central labor unions and under the guidance of a field staff. Additional grants provide for a program now under way consisting of a series of regional two-day conferences followed by local conferences or short courses dealing in general with the same subject matter. The Appalachian project was an OEO pilot program in trade union training that preceded grants to Penn State University for a state program and to the University of Massachusetts for New England. A number of those trained in the pilot program are now on the staff of the Appalachian Trade Union Council, working on OEO and manpower projects.

The Institute for Labor Studies is located administratively in West Virginia University's Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, which includes other extension activity and, as the title indicates--projects in research and development. The Institute regards research as well as education as one of its functions and makes a conscious effort to relate its research programs to on-going education. Its structure provides for a division of staff between the two functions. The labor education staff consists of five full time and one part time. There is a staff of five on the OEO project.

University of Wisconsin. Wisconsin union membership, 1965: 400,000

Founded in 1925, the University of Wisconsin School for Workers is by far the oldest continuing university-based labor education program. The School was established by the university as a response to Wisconsin trade union interest in education, carrying out the "Wisconsin Idea"--that the university should serve all the people in the state. At the time, the University of Wisconsin was the major center of academic interest in unionism, and has continued this interest throughout the years.

The emphasis on service to workers as unionists has remained the basic characteristic of the School's program over the years. As interest in labor education grew, the School developed a national reputation and became a resource that is widely used in national programs, particularly for one-week schools and in staff training. Many trade unionists, especially in the midwest, had their first contact with labor education at the School for Workers, and have a strong attachment to it for that reason. Among unionists, there has never been the suspicion of the university that existed in regard to some of the more recently established programs.

The emphasis on service has also been reflected in the practical character of the courses offered, in the resident activities as well as in the widespread extension classes through which the School makes its program available throughout the state.

The School for Workers is based in the university extension division. It has two centers: the headquarters in Madison, and the university branch in Milwaukee, with staff based at both, in each case forming a labor education faculty with specific expertise in various trade union concerns such as bargaining, administration, industrial engineering, labor history, or labor law. Attention is paid to the development of special teaching materials in each area of instruction.

Operating from these centers, the School conducts extension courses throughout the state during the fall, winter, and spring. These courses are generally eight or nine weeks long; they deal with practical trade union subjects, and almost all of them are taught by the full-time staff of the School for Workers no matter what distance from the staff centers. About 50 such short courses have been taught each year, reaching just under 1,000 students. These are almost equally divided between courses sponsored by a single union, generally in the larger cities, and those sponsored by central labor unions , with the subject matter very similar. A large share of the cost of the extension programs is met by the local adult and vocational education schools, which jointly sponsor the courses and which reimburse the School for Workers for the teaching. The School is now developing a certificate program for those who take eight short courses. A number of conferences are held each year throughout the state, generally sponsored by central labor unions.

The School for Workers pays special attention to its one-week schools. Its services and facilities are used by about a dozen unions each summer with 900 in attendance. More unions hold national summer schools there than at any other university. Expertise in industrial engineering has made the School the location of the two-week industrial engineering institutes sponsored by the AFL-CIO Department of Research, and for staff training for individual unions in the same field. There have been other staff-training programs for individual unions and with the AFL-CIO in collective bargaining and organizing.

There are eight members on the staff of the School for Workers.

The National Institute of Labor Education

The National Institute of Labor Education was established in 1957 as an agency through which it was hoped foundations, unions, universities, and other organizations could cooperate to expand labor education by increasing the amount of money available, primarily from non-labor sources and particularly for experimental programs. NILE was an outgrowth of the Inter-University Labor Education Committee, in which unions and eight universities had worked together in a project funded by The Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education. When this project ended the Fund for Adult Education aided in obtaining the official support of the AFL-CIO for establishing NILE, with a board of directors representing the unions, labor educators, universities, and interested citizens.

It was the original expectation that NILE would develop experimental labor education projects that could be financed by grants from foundations and government agencies and carried out with union cooperation by university labor education centers either individually or jointly. In general it was found that, with few exceptions, neither the foundations nor the government agencies were prepared to provide money for such projects, even when the proposals had been carefully drafted to meet a felt need. This was particularly true after The Ford Foundation withdrew its general support of adult education. Moreover, those agencies which were prepared to provide funds preferred to support programs conducted directly by NILE rather than to channel funds through it to other institutions.

Support for NILE has come from unions, particularly the national AFL-CIO; from foundations, mostly in the form of grants for specific projects; and from government grants, also for specific projects. While the prime focus has been on labor education some of the major projects have been in related fields such as research into the mental health problems of workers, the development of employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth, and the training of foreign trade union visitors to the

United States. These were all government-supported projects.

NILE's two major labor education projects involved resident staff training. The first of these, financed by the Fund for Adult Education, consisted of five ten-week schools (three in 1961 and two in 1962) which concentrated on the teaching of the social sciences in a context meaningful to trade union staff but not directly focused on their job needs. The schools were conducted by the labor education centers at Cornell, Michigan State University, the University of Michigan-Wayne State University, and the University of California at Berkeley. University faculty taught the courses. Seventy-five unionists participated, nearly all of them full-time staff. An over-all evaluation was made, probably the most complete of any labor education project.

In 1963, 1965, and 1966, NILE ran three four-week resident schools for union staff in the south, working with the universities of North Carolina, Texas, and Georgia. This project was also foundation-supported. The AFL-CIO Department of Education joined with NILE in conducting these schools. The curriculum dealt with the problems peculiar to southern unionism, with a special focus on civil rights. There were courses in southern labor history and in the economic and political problems of the region as well as those dealing with more practical tasks of union staff. University faculty members taught the broader courses. In all, 57 southern unionists participated.

Other NILE projects have included two national conferences, one in 1959 and another in 1961; a survey of preretirement preparation for unionists; and the development of labor education materials for the study of ethical standards in unions.

In 1966 NILE affiliated with The American University in Washington, D.C., at that time undertaking two projects: a survey of labor education in the United States, financed by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education and culminating in this report; and the establishment of a Center for Labor Education Materials and Information. NILE also assisted The American University in setting up its Labor Studies Center to develop labor education programs with the unions in the Washington metropolitan area.

Alabama State Department of Education, Trade and Industrial Education Service. Alabama union membership, 1965: 151,000

The Trade and Industrial Education Service of the Alabama State Department of Education has conducted a continuing Workers' Education Program for a number of years. It is the only program of its kind financed by vocational education funds.

There are two activities: short courses for local unions in the traditional tool subjects, and a one-week resident school. The short courses are taught by a full-time staff representative and, unlike almost all the others in this category, run for four sessions in one week, making it possible for the Service to reach throughout the state. There were 25 of these courses in 1965 and 1966, enrolling 467. The two one-week schools in the same period had an attendance of 90. They are sponsored by the Service, with the faculty drawn from the vocational education staff and trade unionists from Alabama and other states.

There is no official pattern of cooperation between the Alabama state union movement and this program, and relations have varied over the years. They were particularly strained when the resident school was conducted on an all-white basis, over the opposition of the state AFL-CIO central body, but this has been corrected. Because the program has been established for some time, it has strong relationships with some unions in the state with whom it works in its local courses and from whom it draws students for its resident school.

School District of Philadelphia

Philadelphia is the only city in the United States where the school district runs a labor education program staffed by labor education specialists. The classes, which deal mainly with the bread-and-butter union subjects, are part of an extensive adult education program carried on by the Division of School Extension. This Division is responsible for adult evening schools, a large vocational training program for adults, and special educational services to various groups in the city including labor. Labor education has been one of its services for more than 20 years. As with the other adult education programs of the Division, there is no charge for labor education classes.

The following summary of the current program is concerned only with labor education activities--not vocational training or job development. The same staff, however, is responsible for arranging vocational classes when requested by unions, such as related training for apprentices, preparation for civil service exams, or union-sponsored courses to prepare for high school equivalency examinations.

Complete figures for the period covered by our survey are not available, but in the nine-month school year of 1965-66 the program held 48 courses; and, during the same period in 1966-67, 51 courses. Most of the courses deal with basic trade union subjects: new members' classes, labor problems, grievance handling, retirees' discussion groups, for example. In the recent period there has been heavy emphasis on steward training classes, in part because the Philadelphia program cooperated with and used the local unionists who were trained to teach stewards in the experimental program at Penn State.

In the fall of 1966 an additional labor education specialist was appointed to the staff and since then the program has expanded. The statistics for the period from September 1966 to the end of June 1967 show 51 courses, with 1,418 enrolled, of which 35 were shop steward training courses. Of the 51 courses, 40 were conducted for individual locals and 11 for joint boards or groups of locals from one union. Two additional courses that were part of Penn State's Union Leadership Academy were also promoted by the program's staff.

During the same period (September 1966 to June 1967), six one-day conferences were held with 380 attending. Five conferences were for individual unions and one was sponsored by the Labor Education Association. This group, which brings together various unions interested in education, has sponsored several city-wide, inter-union programs, including a 1968 conference on urban problems.

The activities of the center have included a course for Negro trade unionists sponsored by the Urban League as part of its special Labor Education Advancement Program (LEAP). A series of trade union orientation sessions has also been conducted for persons in the Opportunities Industrialization Corporation, a program which provides vocational training to persons in the Negro community.

Teachers for the program come from its staff, local labor officials and staff, lawyers, and other interested professionals. The pay for these part-time teachers is low compared to that in university labor education programs because the Philadelphia pay scale is related to rates for teachers in the rest of the city's adult education program and the public schools. This low pay scale limits the program, particularly in the more sophisticated labor subject areas.

The Philadelphia program has the help of an advisory committee, composed of representatives from interested unions, the Division staff concerned with labor groups, and a staff person from the Penn State labor program. This committee gives support and helps recruit for the program.

Short Courses

The traditional programs of university labor education centers for local union activists have been short courses, conferences, and the one-week resident schools. This section will deal with short courses; the following section, with conferences. The one-week schools are discussed in the chapter on union programs.

Table V-2 on the following page indicates the number of short courses conducted by university labor education centers, including the non-university programs in Alabama and Philadelphia. The courses are separated according to the number of class sessions and the kind of union unit which sponsored them. The table also provides the enrollment figures according to the length of the course. The figures show that 85 percent of the courses are six sessions or more, and that three quarters of them are six, seven, or eight sessions long. This pattern has prevailed for a number of years. The longer courses, those with nine sessions or more, include a number of more advanced subjects, some running for a full semester. Some of these were on a specific social science such as economics, but not part of a long-term program.

Two thirds of the short courses were conducted for a single local union or for several locals of the same union. About 30 percent were conducted for central labor unions. Most of the others were university-initiated. The interviews with university labor educators indicate

Table V-2

UNIVERSITY SHORT COURSES, 1965 and 1966 1/ & 4/

By Length of Course

No. of Sessions	No. of Univer-sities	No. of Courses	% of All Courses	Enroll-ments 3/	% of All Enroll-ments
5 or less	17	159	14.9	4,309	15.7
6 and 7	20	391	36.7	10,401	37.9
8	18	426	40.0	10,306	37.6
9 and more	13	90	8.4	2,417	8.8
Total	22 2/	1,066	100.0	27,433	100.0

By Cooperating Organization

Single Local Union	21	586	55.0
Several Locals of Same Union	16	118	11.1
Central Labor Body	13	315	29.5
Other	4	47	4.4
Total	22	1,066	100.0

1/ Does not include courses that are part of long-term programs.

2/ Total indicates the number of different universities holding any short courses.

3/ For those universities providing information only on students completing courses, the enrollment figure was calculated by an adjustment based on the average difference for the universities that reported both enrollment and completion

4/ Includes short courses conducted by the Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia, and the Trade and Industrial Service, Alabama State Department of Education. The Philadelphia figures are for a two-year period not identical with the 1965 and 1966 calendar years.

that the proportion of short courses in cooperation with central labor unions is increasing.

The 1,066 short courses and their enrollment of 27,433 represent the major educational program conducted by the university centers. Is the number increasing? We had difficulty finding any figures for exact comparison. The AFL-CIO Department of Education conducted a survey of university labor education for the academic year 1961-62. This unpublished survey provides us with enrollment figures for a number of universities, but it lumps together short courses and long-term programs. While there were few long-term programs at that time, they did constitute the major effort of some universities. In order to make a comparison we have combined the enrollment figures for short courses and those for long-term programs for the same universities for 1965 and 1966. The results are shown in Table V-3. It must be kept in mind that the current figures are for a two-year period as contrasted with one year in the AFL-CIO survey. Total enrollment in long-term programs was 5,884 in 1965 and 1966. We do not have a figure for the earlier period.

Table V-3 provides a comparison in extension classes for 15 centers. It shows an increase of 37 percent in enrollments, but the growth is quite uneven and in some cases reflects the growth of long-term programs or their beginnings in universities which did not have them in 1961. We know, for example, that the growth in UCLA, Ohio State, and Penn State enrollments is primarily long-term. The increases in Cornell and Wisconsin, however, are all in short courses since they have no long-term programs. Michigan State and Michigan-Wayne both show a sharp rise that reflects an increase in short courses as well as the establishment of long-term programs. The sharpest decline is evident at Rutgers, which had long-term programs during both surveys. Iowa was a fairly new program during the early survey, and is now well established.

In part these figures reflect administrators' attitudes about the importance of short courses. The short course, particularly that for the single union, tends to be that aspect of university labor education which is most closely tied to the union's institutional needs. In that sense it does not relate to the educational development of the individual trade unionist in the same way as do the long-term programs or the credit courses being developed in some centers. The whole question of program emphasis and allocation of resources will be dealt with later in the chapter, after we have examined other activities.

Short Course Costs

The number of short courses conducted by a center may depend on the charges it must make for them. In most instances the costs of these classes are subsidized, the university meeting the administrative costs, other expenses such as travel if necessary, and part of the instructors' fees. There are three institutions that offer courses free of charge: Alabama, Philadelphia, and Cornell for a limited number of instructional hours for each organization. A few universities set a flat fee per two-hour session, ranging from $10 at Michigan State and Michigan-Wayne to $35 at Roosevelt and also at Cornell beyond the free service indicated

Table V-3

COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENTS IN EXTENSION CLASSES OF SELECTED UNIVERSITIES JULY 1, 1961-JUNE 30, 1962; and JAN. 1, 1965-DEC. 31, 1966 [1]

University	One-Year Enrollments July 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962	Two-Year Enrollments Jan. 1, 1965 to Dec. 31, 1966
UCLA	68	602
Connecticut	388	1,795
Cornell	2,073	5,156
Illinois	612	1,219
Indiana	832	1,544
Iowa	20	849
Michigan State	959	2,934
Michigan-Wayne	636	3,436
Minnesota	242	680
Ohio State	329	1,308
Penn State	717	2,448
Roosevelt	590	1,251
Rutgers	1,343	1,473
West Virginia	471	856
Wisconsin	747	1,974
Totals	10,027	27,525

---

[1] The 1961-62 figures are from an unpublished survey made by the AFL-CIO Department of Education. The 1965-66 figures are those gathered during the present survey. Both sets of figures include all continuing classes. Universities for which figures were not collected in both surveys are omitted.

above. The others charge on a per-student basis, making it difficult to know actual costs. Calculating the costs on the basis of an eight-week course for 20 students, the charges in these institutions would range from slightly over $50 at Rutgers to $320 at Hawaii. In a few cases the costs would be under $150, but most are more than that. Illinois, where the charge would be $240, is next highest to Hawaii. Wisconsin's fees are very high compared to the other centers but in almost every instance are paid to the center by the local adult and vocational school with only a nominal charge to the student or the union.

In almost every case where a short course is sponsored by a single union the university charges are paid by the union. When the course is sponsored by a central labor union most students are sponsored by their locals, which pay the fee although some students will pay their own way. Thus, for single union classes, particularly those for small locals, the amount of the charge may be the determining factor in the decision to have the course. Administrators of two university programs that have recently reduced charges, Penn State and Connecticut, testify that the cost reduction is a factor in the growth of their short-course programs. Other centers with low costs (Cornell, Michigan State, Michigan-Wayne, Wisconsin, and Philadelphia) all have large and growing numbers of short courses. That cost is not the sole factor, however, is illustrated by the statistics from Rutgers.

Who Teaches Short Courses?

Another factor in the number of short courses that can be conducted by a center is whether the teaching is done primarily by the center's permanent staff or by teachers hired specifically for the course. The cost to the center per class hour of instruction tends to be much higher when all the teaching is done by its own staff. More important, there is a limit to the number of hours a staff member can spend teaching, particularly when it is the general practice for the labor education staff to combine program development with teaching. Most centers, therefore, use what are called ad hoc or adjunct instructors for the short courses. This is not the practice in three major centers which run a fairly large number of short courses: Wisconsin, Illinois, and Connecticut. There is a feeling in these institutions that the quality of the program suffers when teaching is "farmed out" to those whose specialty is not in the field of labor education. The Wisconsin School for Workers feels that its staff comprises a labor education faculty with expertise in a variety of subjects who are highly qualified to teach the kinds of courses that fit the needs of Wisconsin unionists and that the School cannot find others with these qualifications. Somewhat the same attitude, though less pronounced, exists in Illinois, which has an additional problem because the university financial regulations make it very difficult to budget in advance for the hiring of ad hoc teachers.

Those who favor the use of ad hoc instructors say that for many subjects there are some who can do an effective job, particularly in courses that provide basic training to union stewards and officers. They say, further, that the use of ad hoc teachers permits greater flexibility in program, since course offerings can extend into areas in which the center staff does not have special competence. In some instances the use of such instructors enables the center to provide courses at a distance from its base without the cost in time and money for extensive travel. Aside from Wisconsin the centers with the five largest short-course programs (Cornell, Michigan State, Michigan-Wayne, Penn State, and Philadelphia) report that more than 50 percent of their extension courses are taught by instructors not regularly attached to the center staff. This was also true of about half of the other centers.

There is general agreement that good labor education instructors must have competence in the subject matter, an ability to teach workers, and sympathy for and understanding of unionism.

Where do the centers find such people? Those with the largest short-course programs report as follows. Cornell, reflecting the isolation of the campus from the state's industrial centers, uses 30 percent who are government employees; 25 percent, independent professionals, and 15 percent each from Cornell, other universities, and unions. Cornell regards the concerned academic as the best ad hoc instructor. Michigan-Wayne draws half from the faculties of the two universities, 20 percent from unions, and 10 percent each from other universities, government, and independent professionals. Michigan State draws 20 percent each from its own campus, other universities, unions, and teachers, with 10 percent each coming from government and independent professionals. Philadelphia did not report this information, but an examination of program reports shows that it uses a large number of unionists, some from government, a few from universities, and independent professionals. The other universities with numerous short courses, Wisconsin and Connecticut, use their own faculty for almost all the teaching.

A few universities have trained instructors who have been used later for teaching in their own programs, particularly for stewards' training. Michigan State and Michigan-Wayne have done this cooperatively for a number of years. Indiana and Roosevelt have started more recently. Philadelphia has used a number of those trained by Penn State. Usually the instructor-trainees are unionists with a good background in course content but who need help in developing outlines and in teaching method. All the universities involved regard the effort worthwhile.

The administrators who use ad hoc teachers recognize the problem of assuring quality. One Cornell administrator feels that as the subject matter gets more sophisticated it is more difficult to find teachers who will take adequate time for preparation. Cornell has some content specialists attached to its extension program to deal with this problem. With all ad hoc instructors there is the need to make certain that they do prepare, that they have the ability to communicate effectively with workers, and that their pattern of teaching does not become rote. For these reasons centers which use ad hoc teachers tend to cultivate specialists in a number of subjects in whom they have confidence. Some centers hold conferences with the instructor prior to the beginning of his teaching; and an administrator may sometimes visit the class to observe while it is in session, although this is not so likely when an instructor has taught for a long time. When the course is taught for a single union the administrator will sometimes discuss the teaching with the sponsoring group. A few centers bring short-course instructors together for conferences to discuss educational methods and problems and may present new content information. Cornell does this, and has also prepared notebooks of teaching materials in common areas of instruction, such as steward training and union administration, for use by ad hoc instructors.

Short Course Content

Regarding the content of short courses, the centers concentrate very heavily on those subjects of immediate use to the unionist in his day-to-day activity. Particularly in courses for single unions the majority deal with problems of bargaining and union administration, the latter including leadership development and communication skills. When a center works with a union over a long period, the courses get broader, moving to trade union and social problems, and they also become more sophisticated, in a few instances applying the findings of behavioral science research to union problems. More rarely the union will welcome departure from the traditional areas of labor education. Cornell, for example, has developed courses with some unions dealing with labor and the arts, and others based on reading and discussion. Other centers have conducted courses in preretirement training.

The courses for central labor unions also emphasize the traditional tool subjects in bargaining and union administration. But they are more likely than the single-union courses to include labor legislation, labor history, general trade union problems, psychology, and social issues such as urban affairs or civil rights. A few centers initiate inter-union short courses with the acceptance rather than the sponsorship of the local labor movement. A recent Cornell catalogue of such courses in the New York Metropolitan area included a number for union staff in sophisticated areas of bargaining and union administration; others dealing with problems of civil rights and urban affairs; a course in reading skills; and a series of credit courses in industrial relations and psychology.

Because they draw students from various backgrounds, inter-union courses add a different dimension to labor education, even in the tool subjects. The class cannot deal with a specific seniority system or grievance procedure. Accepted practices in one union will be challenged by students from another. More attention, therefore, must be paid to the "why" of a practice and less to the "how."

How Many Dropouts?

For a voluntary activity, labor education short courses hold their students very well. We sought information from the university centers on registrations and completions and only 10 were able to provide this information. The retention rate is very high, ranging from a low of about 75 percent to above 90 percent, most of the institutions reporting well above 80 percent. The length of the course does not affect the retention rate; nor does the use of ad hoc teachers. While we did not ask this question, we were able to compare the figures for four universities conducting a large number of short courses. Two of the four, Connecticut and Wisconsin, used their own staff to teach most of the courses while the other two, Roosevelt and Michigan-Wayne, used ad hoc teachers for most of theirs. The retention rates for Roosevelt and Connecticut are about identical, above 90 percent; while those for Wisconsin and Michigan-Wayne are both about 80 percent.

Who Attends Short Courses

What kind of unionists attend the short courses? No center was able to provide a profile based on a survey. Many of the centers use registration cards requesting such details as age, education, and union position, but rarely do they tabulate this information. Penn State is now conducting an elaborate study of all the registrants for its programs, but the information is not yet available. Program administrators know that single-union courses are attended by local officers and other activists and they feel that the same can be said of the inter-union classes.

We were able to examine the registration cards for a small but atypical group of courses sponsored by the central labor union and conducted by The American University in Washington, D.C., in 1967 and 1968. The cards provided details on age, previous education, union membership, and union office held. The tabulation of this information is shown in Appendix III. We make no effort to generalize from this isolated instance.

What Unions Run Short Courses

What unions work with the centers to develop short courses? The picture varies from state to state because the union initiative for education is local, not national. A large proportion of the courses, therefore, are for local organizations of national unions that have no education department. One administrator noted that the unions most receptive to education are those which are new or ones that have experienced some crisis that challenged previous practices. Examples cited were a newly organized group; two unions in which old officers were removed because of corruption; and a fourth that faced problems in the relationship between established leaders and a new minority membership. In none of the unions involved was there a national education program. While none of the other administrators used the same language, many of the examples they cited fit the general description. Generally mentioned were the locals of government employee unions, some of them newly organized and others forced to change long-established practices. This group includes a large number of organizations not affiliated with AFL-CIO, such as the Nurses' Association and the independent associations of state and local government workers.

Some locals of national unions with strong education programs use university centers; others do not. There seems to be no predictable pattern, not even one relating to the personal contact between local leaders and the staff of the center, although that is reported as a major factor in program development. While national union education directors often work with universities on national programs such as one-week schools and staff training, and occasionally in regional programs through conferences, it is not common for them to work with the centers on continuing education for the locals. Nevertheless, a large number of the courses are run for locals of unions having national programs.

When a new university center is established there seems to be a reservoir of latent demand. This has been the case in Massachusetts, which reports that it cannot meet the demand from a great variety of unions. The response may depend upon the willingness of the center to promote actively and the relationship developed between the center staff and local leadership.

A number of centers have made a special effort to develop programs with the construction unions, with moderate success. Much of the traditional labor education content relating to bargaining and union administration is not appropriate to the construction industry; consequently new courses have been developed for this purpose.

A successful educational experience with a local union has usually led to continuing cooperation. Some centers stress more attention to program planning over several years to make the education of greatest value to the union. Cornell has developed such long-term planning with many locals. Illinois, Michigan State, and Rutgers are others with the same objective.

To this point we have commented on courses sponsored in cooperation with single unions. Central labor union courses attract a broader registration. Almost every university administrator conducting inter-union classes reported that many of the students come from locals that had previously not been involved in education. This is one way in which unionists from the construction industry have become interested in courses for their own unions.

Conferences

Of all the university labor education activity, short courses reach the most unionists, but conferences are not far behind. Twenty-two university centers held 419 union education conferences in 1965 and 1966, with an enrollment of more than 23,000.

The figures for the various kinds of conferences held, categorized by sponsorship, length, and whether they were resident or nonresident, are shown in Table V-4. Like the short courses, most of the conferences are for one union at a time, 70 percent compared with 66 for short courses; and most of the other conferences were conducted for central labor unions. The "other inter-union" category includes some conferences for such organizations as the labor press association and some that were initiated by the centers. About 40 percent were resident conferences, held on campus or at some other conference center. The rest were held in the home communities of the workers. Sixty percent of the conferences were one day long, the rest divided about equally between those lasting

Table V-4

UNIVERSITY CONFERENCES BY TYPE AND LENGTH
1965 and 1966

Type of Conference	No. of Universities[1]	No. of Conferences	% of All Conferences	Enrollments	% of All Enrollments
Conferences for One Union					
Resident:					
1-day	9	42	10.0	2,130	9.2
2-day	12	36	8.5	2,194	9.5
3-day	13	32	7.6	2,114	9.1
4-day	2	3	.7	97	.4
Total	18	113	26.8	6,535	28.2
Nonresident:					
1-day	17	132	31.5	7,009	30.3
2-day	8	16	3.8	1,403	6.0
3 days & more	7	28	6.6	1,144	4.9
Total	19	176	41.9	9,556	41.2
TOTAL	22	289	68.7	16,091	69.4
Conferences for Central Labor Unions					
Resident:					
1-day	1	2	.4	100	.4
2-day	6	9	2.1	613	2.6
3 days & more	6	10	2.3	937	4.0
Total	9	21	4.8	1,650	7.0
Nonresident:					
1-day	15	65	15.5	2,692	11.6
2 days & more	4	4	.9	309	1.3
Total	16	69	16.4	3,001	12.9
TOTAL	18	90	21.2	4,651	19.9
Other Inter-Union Conferences					
Resident:					
1-day	1	1	.2	50	.2
2-day	7	10	2.3	769	3.3
3 days & more	4	6	1.4	285	1.2
Total	9	17	3.9	1,104	4.7
Nonresident:					
1-day	5	15	3.5	829	3.5
2 days & more	4	8	1.9	396	1.7
Total	8	23	5.4	1,225	5.2
TOTAL	11	40	9.3	2,329	9.9
TOTAL ALL CONFS.	22	419	99.2 [2]	23,071	99.2 [2]

---

[1] Totals in this column indicate the number of different universities holding any such program.

[2] Percentages total less than 100 because of rounding.

two days and those that were longer. As would be expected, a higher proportion of the resident conferences are more than one day long.

For comparison with the past we have again only the unpublished survey of the AFL-CIO Department of Education for the academic year 1961-62, which includes some of the universities for which we have figures but does not categorize them as we did. The comparisons shown in Table V-5 indicate that there has been little change in the total enrollments, although the figures for some universities have dropped sharply while others have risen.

Conference Purposes

In purpose, many of the single-union conferences may strongly resemble the majority of the short courses: to provide skill training to local union activists. Some will be held for individual locals, but more of them will bring together representatives of locals from the same union. The latter is particularly true of the resident conferences but also for some that are nonresident. Some of the single-union conferences will mix tool training with sessions dealing with social issues, the latter taking place at an evening session or a luncheon.

The central labor union and other inter-union conferences are more likely to deal with broad issues. Those sponsored by state central bodies will often consider legislative issues, sometimes those directly affecting workers--workmen's and unemployment compensation, for example--but often subjects such as taxation or reapportionment. Local central labor body conferences are more likely to vary, ranging from international affairs and urban problems to sessions on the effective functioning of the central body. Some of these, and the conferences in the "other inter-union" category, will deal with subject matter in which the center is conducting a special project such as vocational rehabilitation at Rutgers or poverty in West Virginia.

Most conferences are much larger than the normal class, and the educational techniques used reflect this; they resort to more speeches and more movies. The best of the conferences will develop student involvement through small group discussions under experienced leaders, or through buzz groups and similar devices. Generally, however, conference participants are much less involved in the learning process than those who attend classes.

The conference does, nevertheless, bring people together for a concentrated educational experience in which a high morale can be developed to motivate learning. When it is a resident conference the expenses are generally met by the local union, making possible the selection of participants who have responsibility in the local. The conference is also a more traditional union activity, and unionists may be involved more easily. This has its disadvantages since most union conferences are not education in purpose and they are often regarded by the participants as an opportunity for recreation.

Table V-5

COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENTS IN ONE-TO-FOUR-DAY CONFERENCES
SPONSORED BY SELECTED UNIVERSITIES [1]
JULY 1, 1961-JUNE 30, 1962; and JANUARY 1, 1965-DECEMBER 31, 1966

University		One-Year Enrollments July 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962	Two-Year Enrollments Jan. 1, 1965 to Dec. 31, 1966
Berkeley		1,500	1,617
UCLA		420	1,405
Connecticut		744	1,334
Cornell		683	2,140
Illinois		997	965
Indiana		618	1,269
Iowa		146	378
Michigan State		465	1,690
Michigan-Wayne		720	453
Ohio State		237	1,715
Penn State		368	709
Roosevelt		900	452
Rutgers		1,060	2,037
West Virginia		195	1,366
Wisconsin		641	1,136
	Totals	9,694	18,666

---

[1] The 1961-62 figures are from an unpublished survey made by the AFL-CIO Department of Education. The 1965-66 figures were gathered during the present survey. Both sets include resident and nonresident conferences. Universities for which figures were not collected in both surveys have been omitted.

Some centers are now beginning to use the weekend conference as a way of reaching out to isolated sections of the state for subject matter which otherwise would be taught in a short course. A two-day conference can provide about as many hours of instruction as a seven- or eight-session course; and if the group is small enough, traditional classroom techniques can be used. Cornell has begun to do this in upstate New York for communities where it is not possible to get ad hoc instructors for courses meeting once a week but who are willing to go for a weekend. Wisconsin recently sponsored a series of weekend labor law institutes throughout the state. These are illustrations of a general trend.

Long-Term Programs

One of the changes in labor education over the last 15 years has been a new emphasis on long-term programs which stress the social sciences and attempt to provide more depth in the courses through teaching level and by asking students to read and prepare for class. These programs are long term because they offer a series of courses held once a week over a period of several years, with a special certificate at the end for the student who has completed the required curriculum. All the programs include work in economics, politics, sociology, and history; and a number of them also include courses on union administration, leadership, communications, and similar advanced labor subjects. Several include courses in the arts and humanities. At present 13 of these programs are in operation, with 3 more in their initial stages. 1/

Why Long-Term Programs

The earliest of the long-term programs originated at the University of Chicago, which in 1949 began a six-month course for union officers on bargaining and leadership and gradually expanded this to a two-year program with the second year focused on the social sciences and the humanities. In 1959, this program received a grant from the Fund for Adult Education of The Ford Foundation and from then until 1964 provided a two-year course of weekly sessions dealing with the role of the unionist as an individual in a free society.

The thinking behind the Chicago program illustrates one reason for the general move toward long-term programs:

> "It is obvious that the labor movement...has within it the potential for providing a primary emphasis for the development of a truly liberal, dynamic democracy. It has a highly important role to play in the achievement of those basic ends that concern the society as a whole.... The intellectual breadth and awareness of the vanguard of labor leadership is then an important concern of the university, and the Union Leadership Program is directed toward the achievement of such ends....
>
> "Specifically, in terms of curriculum the broad objectives as they are articulated today are: (1) to provide an understanding of the broad social, political, and economic traditions of American society, (2) to develop an appreciation of the sciences and humanities as aids in understanding one's self and one's society, and (3) to provide an understanding of the over-all drift of American society: where it is going and the alternative courses of action that are available." 2/

The Chicago program also stated that it hoped that students would gain a desire for continuing education after the program, that they would take reading and logic courses to improve their skills in handling the subject matter of the courses, and that, in thinking critically, they would widen their perspective to see themselves as part of a broader society.

At the same time The Ford Foundation gave a grant to the University of California at Los Angeles to develop a program in "Liberal Arts for Labor." This program, like the one in Chicago, stressed the social sciences and the humanities but, unlike the Chicago program, did not aim solely at labor leadership. The first director pointed out:

> "...few trade unions any longer restrict their operations to simple bargaining. They have moved officially from such strictly bread-and-butter operations to concerned involvement and activity in the broad social problems of our society, and they have become actively engaged in helping to fashion our nation's domestic and foreign policies.... The kind of educational program needed to help implement present union operations is one based on the broadest kind of curriculum, with courses that help both the union officer and the union member (many of whom left school in early adolescence) to gain understanding of themselves, of their fellow man, and of the society in which they live, and of the role now possible for labor--given a membership and officialdom equal to the task. What is needed, today, is the addition of a broad program in the social sciences and the humanities." 3/

In the beginning the UCLA program simply offered a number of "liberal arts for labor" short courses each semester, but in 1961 the long-term concept was added to the program and a special Certificate in Labor Studies is now given to those who complete eight courses chosen from four groups of subjects. Courses are often tailored to meet special needs of union groups in Los Angeles, then fitted to Certificate requirements, since UCLA regards the long-term aspect of the program as only one of its functions.

At about the same time that Chicago was reorganizing its program the Labor Education and Research Service at Ohio State University launched its long-term program. Behind this lay dissatisfaction with the current emphasis on tool training in labor education and an attempt to deepen course content and quality. This thinking was expressed by S. C. Kelley, then head of the Ohio State LERS, as follows:

> "I believe that universities /in labor education/ must move with increasing emphasis toward educational activities that are more liberal in nature, more intensive in form, and more continuous in participation. They must abandon the present emphasis on the short conference, the isolated short course, and the functional workshop.... More specifically, I believe that universities must develop a 'program' of education in which the primary criteria are qualitative and the primary end is the maximum development of the individual capacity to sense, to perceive, to evaluate, and to reason....
>
> "Programs structured on this conceptual base will involve intensive education through a maximum participation by the individual and greater depth of subject matter penetration. They will include a wide range of subject matter content with a primary emphasis on the social sciences and the humanities....

> They will apply to labor education the same qualitative standards that are ordinarily applied in other areas of university activity...." 4/

With this approach Ohio State developed its long-term program, which now offers courses over a four-year period in yearly sectors on labor, politics and economics, sociology, and the humanities. This program is still the main educational effort of the labor education service throughout Ohio.

Another early program that influenced the development of long-term programs was the Union Leadership Academy in New Jersey, first formulated in 1955 by labor educators at Rutgers University and the labor leaders in the state. Rutgers was also concerned with the fragmentary, discontinuous nature of labor education programs, whether regarded from the viewpoint of the individual or from the viewpoint of a given union, and it was felt that "an experimental design in labor education based on the assumption that some pattern of sustained, integrated educational effort with a planned progression of learning and experience for union members at the local union, district, and staff levels must soon be established if any serious attempt was to be made to help develop leadership for expanding union organization." 5/ The original ULA concept at Rutgers set up a series of different programs starting with basic tool courses and progressing through various activities and classes. What is now called the Union Leadership Academy was the second step in the pyramid.

An experimental program when it was launched in 1955, the long-term program of ULA has changed and expanded since. It is now a three-state program, with the labor education services of Rutgers, Penn State, and West Virginia giving the same seven courses in each state and bringing together all students once a year at one place for an educational assembly and again for a joint graduation. A recent description of the ULA program by a labor educator at Penn State states that the "curriculum draws heavily upon the academic fields of history, economics, political science, and psychology for its materials. Although the presentation of such material is oriented towards the interests and educational backgrounds of the trade union members who are students in the classes, there is no readily apparent immediate relevance of course work to either job or union functions.... The professed goals of the Academy are to promote the exercise of responsibility of a worker as a union member, union leader, and community citizen, and to develop the worker as a human being.... 6/

Thus the long-term programs as they were originally conceived put emphasis on the development of individually interested unionists. They were an attempt to do several things: (1) broaden knowledge and interest beyond the bread-and-butter subjects into the larger concerns of the labor movement; (2) improve the academic quality of courses by deepening content and asking the student to read and work; and (3) provide a series of courses--a rounded curriculum--that would help experienced unionists grow and progress intellectually over a period of time.

In a sense these programs were a response to changes in the labor movement itself, which was much better established than in the 1940's when basic tool training had first priority. By the 1950's, some labor educators began to feel that local labor leadership required both more sophisticated training in trade union functions and better understanding of the broad goals of labor.

Since the emphasis of the long-term programs limits their appeal to a smaller group of unionists, classes have been set up almost entirely on an inter-union basis. With unionists from various unions and industries in the classes, the treatment of even advanced tool subjects becomes more sophisticated and widens the students' perspective on the labor movement.

What are Long-Term Programs Like?

From the original programs, all of which are still in existence except the Chicago program which ended in 1964, have grown numerous others. The present 13 programs vary considerably, both because of varying philosophies on the part of the directors and because universities use them in different ways to fit into their over-all program of labor education in the state. Some of the present programs see themselves as advanced in the sense that they aim at unionists who already have some experience in labor education and activity and have acquired basic tool education. Other long-term programs are used to provide a curriculum of labor subjects so that interested unionists of varying degrees of experience in a city or town will have the opportunity to take a rounded spectrum of courses and will be motivated by the certificate to complete the set. Basic information on the existing 13 programs is given in Table V-6

The programs vary greatly in length and content. All share an emphasis on the social sciences, but some include a number of advanced tool courses like labor law and union administration in their set of required courses. All also share a requirement that students read in preparation for class, whether they read paperbacks, prepared materials, or magazine reprints. In the majority of cases much of the teaching is done by teachers from universities and colleges, so that the teaching approach is often more academic than the usual labor short course.

One of the significant differences in the programs is the length of the course units and the amount of time which the student is asked to commit to the program when he enrolls. Ten of the programs enroll students on a "semester" basis, for short courses ranging from eight to 15 weeks. At the end of one course the student must enroll in the next course, pretty much on his own initiative. Three of the programs enroll students on a longer basis. Two have yearly units, where the student enrolls for a year's course, with a certificate at the end, and can then go on for three more yearly courses to get a final certificate. One program runs for two years and asks applicants to commit themselves in the beginning to finish the two years. The programs organized on a longer basis are able to provide more integration and often more depth in the material covered, while the "semester" programs more nearly resemble a series of short courses.

Table V-6

LONG-TERM PROGRAMS

University	Number of Subjects Required	Length of Each Course	Total Class-room Hours	Years to Com-plete	Cities w/Program Operating Spring 1968	Costs per Student
UCLA	8 (of 17) (choice in groups)	10 weeks (2 hrs. a class)	160	4	1	$20 per course
U. Cal. Berkeley	5 (of 8)	8 - 10 weeks (2 hrs. a class)	80 - 100	2 - 3	7	$5 per course
Ill. ILIR (Chicago)	6 (of 23) (choice in groups)	12 weeks (2 hrs. a class)	144	2 - 3	1	$22 per course
Indiana	5 (of 6)	15 weeks (2½ hrs. a class)	187½	2½	2	$32 per course
Iowa	6	8 weeks (2½ hrs. a class)	120	3	4	$15 per course
Michigan - Wayne State	integrated program of various subjects for 2 years	30 weeks a year (2½ hrs. a class) + 4 days confs.	150	2	2	$120 for 2 yrs.
Michigan State	6 (of 7)	10 weeks (2 hrs. a class)	120	2 - 3	9	Charge is $100 per course for group
Minnesota	8	10 - 12 weeks (2 hrs. a class)	160 - 192	2 - 3	4	$12.50 per course
Ohio State	integrated program of various subjects each of 4 years	24 weeks a year (2 hrs. a class)	192	4	9	$60 per year
Roosevelt	integrated program of various subjects each of 4 years	32 weeks a year (3 hrs. a class)	384	4	1	$96 per year
ULA		6 8-wk. courses plus 1 16-wk. course (W. Va. breaks the 16-wk. course into 2 courses) and a 1-day conference each year (2 hrs. a class)	128			Per Course
Penn State	7			2 - 4	11	$10-$15
Rutgers	7			4	3	$15
W. Va.	8			4	8	$ 5

Some Specific Programs

Differences among these programs can best be illustrated by describing several of them. The Labor School set up by the University of Michigan-Wayne State labor program is a two-year course of classes, with students meeting one night a week for 30 sessions a year. There are four required days of assemblies, for orientation and evaluation, in the two years. This program, which provides a set series of social science courses, regards itself as an advanced program for unionists who already have some labor education experience or considerable activity in unions, and tries to steer applicants without such experience into courses in a Basic Labor School before they enter the long-term program. Applicants are asked to commit themselves to the full two-year program before they start, and once in the program they go through it with the same group of students. There is considerable educational counseling by the labor education staff, and students are given courses in reading improvement and in preparing research reports.

Two other programs are organized on a yearly basis. The program at Roosevelt University recruits labor leaders in Chicago for a 32-week course for each of four years. Students are asked to commit themselves for a year at a time. During the first year the program covers a variety of tool and social science subjects in three-hour sessions each week under the title of "Labor Leadership in a Dynamic Society." Groups of sessions are taught by various professors and "experts," but the program is tied together by one labor educator who acts as coordinator and attends all sessions. Roosevelt's use of films in this program is unique and will be discussed later.

The Ohio State program is similarly organized in yearly sectors--the labor sector, the political and economic sector, the social sector, and the human sector--and students are asked to commit themselves for a year at a time in the hope that they will continue. One or two teachers, usually professors employed on a part-time basis, conduct each yearly sector. Unlike Michigan-Wayne, and to some extent Roosevelt, relatively few short courses are given in the nine areas where Ohio State is running the long-term program, so that there are many inexperienced students in the classes as well as union officers.

The other ten programs are all organized on a "semester" basis, although the semester varies between eight and 15 weeks. At the end of each course, students must sign up for the next course, and the group of people varies from one course to the next. In many of these programs the student has some choice of courses but must take seven out of eight, for example, to get a certificate. The program at Indiana University, as an example, asks students to take five of six courses in Collective Bargaining, Labor Law, Communications, Psychology, Government and Politics, and Economics. Indiana plans to add two more choices to this program in the next year--courses in Reading and Study Skills and in Sociology. The Indiana program is similar, although not identical, to several others.

In the programs at the UCLA and at the University of Illinois in Chicago the student chooses courses from various groups designed to give him a broad range.

What Content?

Some of these programs see themselves as advanced beyond the tool subjects and deal mainly with the social sciences. The program at Michigan and the tri-state ULA fall into this category. Others (like Minnesota, the University of California at Berkeley, and Indiana) include a number of courses keyed more directly to union problems on communications, labor law, leadership, psychology, and union administration. This kind of curriculum for the long-term program often prevails in states where the university does not offer many short courses in tool subjects and thus uses the long-term program to fill part of the need for these. Only three universities offer courses in collective bargaining as part of the long-term program.

Several universities use the long-term program to try to broaden unionists' understanding of present-day scientific developments and to acquaint them with the arts, particularly literature. Current topics such as poverty, civil rights, urban problems, and Negro history may be taken up in the social science courses or offered in special courses.

Thus the over-all concept of the long-term program has been interpreted by each university to fit its situation and approach. There are several different types of students who enroll. Some people take the entire program to get a deeper understanding of the labor movement. Others hope that the knowledge gained and the certificate received will help them get ahead in the labor movement and, occasionally, outside it. Many students simply enroll for the course that is of interest to them and go no further. While the statistics are fragmentary, it seems clear that a large number of students never take more than one or two courses, but many universities feel that this in itself has value. The long-term program often makes it possible to offer a rounded program of courses in a locality and a number of broader subjects than the central labor body might ordinarily sponsor.

Most of these programs are officially sponsored by the central labor body in the city where they are given, although in a few cases individual unions have set up long-term groups. The central body does not finance the program, however, except in one instance, and its involvement varies. A number of universities have made considerable effort to build educational groups or committees connected with the central labor union to discuss programming and help recruit, with varying success. Some programs, notably those run by Penn State, West Virginia, and the University of California at Berkeley, have been fairly successful in getting the central labor unions or subsidiary groups to help administer the program, collect fees, take enrollment, etc. To achieve this the university labor education staff has to make considerable effort to build and maintain interest among the labor people responsible.

Classes are held in union halls and on college campuses, both those of the sponsoring university and those of other colleges around the state. Most classes are held at night, but a few are held during the day for the convenience of shift workers and full-time officials.

Who Enrolls?

Who are the students? Mainly local union officers and stewards, with a sprinkling of full-time staff plus a group of members with no official position in their locals. One program (the University of California at Berkeley) reports that 26 to 50 percent of the students are full-time staff; four programs report attendance between 10 and 25 percent by full-time officials; and the others report an insignificant percentage of full-time people. There seems to be no important difference between those drawing more full-time staff and those that do not.

Possibly of more significance is the relative percentage of students who are local union leaders of one sort or another. A study of Ohio State in 1963-64 and again in 1965-66 showed that from 25 to 30 percent of their students in those years held no position, while the remaining 70 to 75 percent were officers, stewards, trustees, or full-time persons. A recent report by Indiana University, based on a survey of participants in the Fort Wayne program, showed that 70 percent of that group held some labor position and that most of the others had held union office in the past, so that a total of 91 percent of the group could be regarded as active unionists. Similarly the program of the University of Michigan-Wayne State estimates that about 75 percent of their students are holding some union office or job and a number of the others have been officials in the past. Since these three programs differ in content and in the situation in which they operate, the general picture they present is probably true in most of the other programs.

While the long-term programs draw from all the unions active in labor education, there is general agreement that they also draw individuals from unions that have not had much education activity. Thus these programs, like all inter-union classes, offer an opportunity for education to motivated individuals with few other channels. The programs seem to draw from minority groups (Negroes, Mexican-Americans, women) generally in proportion to their numbers in the local labor movement, although two big city programs (Roosevelt in Chicago and Michigan-Wayne State) report a high percentage of Negroes in attendance.

What Are The Costs?

In a number of cases the cost of these programs is high, and in several programs the classes pay their own way. The fees do not necessarily keep individuals out of the program, however, because in many instances the local unions pay for the people involved. The union may send a person as a sort of "representative" or the individual may persuade his local to pay his fee. Per-student fees range from $5 per course to $32 per course for those programs running on a "semester" basis; and from $60 to $96 for the three programs running on a yearly basis (see Table V-6). The labor program at Michigan State makes a flat charge of $100 per course to the sponsoring central labor union, which usually absorbs this charge without asking money from the students.

Who Teaches?

Teachers come from the university's labor education staff and from its regular college faculty, from faculty at junior colleges, and from other colleges in the state. Most of the programs use their own staff to teach a number of the courses, both because it helps them keep in touch with the program and because it is often difficult to find good teachers who can relate the subject matter to union interests. College professors are recruited mainly to teach the more academic social science subjects, and program administrators spend considerable time looking for persons who are interested and able to adapt traditional teaching to adult unionists.

Finding teachers is not always easy, particularly for classes in outlying areas. Professors from the central university often do not want to travel long distances to teach and sometimes local colleges cannot supply persons interested and competent to teach labor groups. A number of the present program directors feel that the difficulty of finding good teachers is a major administrative problem in the long-term programs.

The amount of time that the university can devote to selection and supervision of such teachers has an obvious effect on the over-all quality of the program. Once a teacher is found, labor education staff provide him with orientation about the group and often sit in classes to give further guidance. Some programs have prepared teaching outlines and student materials which in essence help guide course content. Others discuss the course with the teacher, then ask him to submit an outline showing the approach he intends to take. Two programs, at Roosevelt and Michigan-Wayne, have an over-all coordinator who helps tie together the various sessions.

Teaching Methods

Because many of the subjects are traditionally academic, and because a number of the teachers come from regular university faculty, frequently the classes are taught from the usual academic approach, beginning with an exposition of theory and abstractions and moving on to discussion of concrete problems. This is a change from traditional labor education teaching, which starts with a concrete problems of concern to the students and moves from there to the concepts and theories that illuminate it. While the survey did not provide an opportunity to observe students' reactions to the more academic approach, some program staff regard this as a problem because students have difficulty in seeing relevance in the courses and in understanding the theory when it does not relate to their experience. This is one factor that makes it imperative to select teachers carefully.

Teaching methods vary with the individual instructor. In the more academic subjects there is considerable reliance on the college pattern of lecture followed by discussion and questions; but labor education staff and some academic teachers often use a variety of cases, problems, questionnaires, and discussion techniques. The only program that departs radically from this pattern is the one at Roosevelt University, which uses films in a highly imaginative way. In one year, for example, 16 of the 32 sessions were built around the use of films. A number of these were regular feature films like "The Magnificent Seven," a Japanese film used as a basis for discussing the problem of leadership and the role of professionals and members in determining policy in a group. Others, such as "The Oxbow Incident," "The Organizer," and "Shop Steward," have more obvious relevance to union problems, but all are tied into the subject under discussion in that section of the program.

Student Reading

Reading in preparation for class is an important feature of all the long-term programs, and administrators hope that this experience will give students the reading habit beyond the classroom. A number of programs rely on paperback books such as The Making of Modern Society by Heilbroner, Politics in America by Brogan, The Making of a President by White, and Toil and Trouble by Brooks. Others use regular college textbooks or their own prepared materials. The tri-state ULA, for example, has prepared seven notebooks for use in its courses and the new program at Iowa is currently putting together materials for its courses under a Title I grant which helps finance the program. These and the prepared materials of other universities have a wide range in approach--varying from simplified exposition of traditional subject matter in a subject like economics to collections of pertinent articles and sources or a series of problem-oriented expositions with questions and hand-outs for discussion. Many teachers supplement the basic material in the courses with reprints from labor publications and magazines and encourage students to buy extra paperback books.

How much of this material is read? Comments by program heads indicate that where administrators of the program insist that reading be done, and where the teachers use the readings in class, some reading is universal. More motivated individuals read a good deal, and a number of them get the habit and go on to read additional books.

Although there is emphasis on reading, only four of the programs have made reading improvement courses a required part of the curriculum --UCLA, Michigan State, Michigan-Wayne, and the University of Illinois in Chicago. These courses emphasize how to read for comprehension, how to grasp the main points, retention, and study skills. Reading improvement does not have to take place in separate courses; it can be done effectively as part of a content course if the two instructors will work together, but none of the programs have tried this. The lack of attention to reading skills in most programs seems unfortunate because students who have difficulty in reading will either ignore the assignments or become discouraged and drop out.

Two programs also seek to improve student skills in compiling and writing a report. The Michigan-Wayne program has a final course in which students research and write a report on a labor problem, then present it in class and lead discussions on it. The Michigan State program includes a junior version of this, a course in which the student learns to outline and write a report on a union subject.

How Popular?

How much do these programs appeal to unionists? The survey figures show a total enrollment of 5,884 in the eleven long-term programs operating during 1965-66, but this total does not show the number of individuals involved. A person enrolled in the Ohio State program, for example, which operates on a yearly basis, would show up twice in this figure if he enrolled both in 1965 and in 1966. For the same two-year period, one person in the ULA program, which operates on a "semester" basis, would be counted as four enrollments, if he took four courses. Moreover, the figure does not show how many people took one course and no more. This statistical problem also makes it impossible to make meaningful comparisons in enrollment between one university and another.

Several programs have found that after a year or two it becomes more difficult to enroll new students in a given city, and they feel that they have "skimmed the cream" of individuals there. One program head, in a state where the program operates in several medium-sized cities, has come to the conclusion that it will have to operate intermittently, running a few years in a city, then ceasing for a while until a new group develops.

Other program heads, however, interpret the problem differently. They believe that a long-term program has to be built on a base of tool courses like grievance handling and parliamentary procedure, whether these courses are given by unions or by the university. This base provides new recruits for the long-term program every year, and at the same time university service to the bread-and-butter needs of the unions establishes relationships with top labor leaders whose support is invaluable in promoting the long-term courses.

Support by top labor leadership in the local community is an important factor in the success of the long-term programs, and some program administrators find this a problem. There are union officers and staff who feel that the long-term programs are not directly related to labor's needs and may even motivate some students to leave the labor movement for wider fields. Others are concerned lest the long-term program build their competition in the union. Attitudes like these are a problem in many educational endeavors, of course, whether long-term or no, but they are one reason why universities feel they must work to build support among the local labor establishment for the program.

How Many Complete the Program?

In the University of Michigan-Wayne State two-year program, which has now had experience with three different two-year groups of students, a little over 60 percent of the 286 students who enrolled originally received a two-year certificate, which requires attendance at 80 percent of the classes and conferences. This program finds its greatest dropout rate in the course of the first year, when about 25 to 30 percent of the students leave for personal reasons, lack of interest, or failure to attend the required number of classes.

The Roosevelt program had a total enrollment of 363 students for its first-year program in the five years from 1962 through 1967. Of the 363, 89 percent successfully completed one year. Less than half of the graduates continue for the second year of the program.

Figures for those programs that operate courses on a "semester" basis are hard to come by. The Indiana program, which requires five 15-week courses for the special certificate, found that of 60 who started in Indianapolis 25 (41 percent) had graduated three years later. The other programs do not have meaningful statistics as yet, but program directors generally agree that many students simply take one or two courses that interest them and go no further. Universities such as UCLA feel that one function of the program is to fill this "short course" need. While they would like to see greater retention for the long term, they would not want to exclude the more casual students.

The rather high dropout rate means, however, that it is difficult to maintain any set sequence of courses and any progression from one course to the next for the individual student. In most programs a student can enter the sequence at any point because there is not enough enrollment for the university to give beginning courses every year. Penn State, which has a preferred sequence in its ULA program, is concerned about this problem since some courses should be built on the background provided by earlier ones in the sequence.

Various methods are used to develop the students' identity with the program and to motivate them to continue. In some places the labor education staff person who is responsible for the program spends a good deal of time counseling individuals and establishing friendly relations with them. Some programs also use one-day or half-day conferences during the year to bring everyone together. Minnesota tries to use much the same faculty in an area from year to year, and uses its labor education staff in all the various areas, so that the faculty provide some identity for the program. A number of programs also try to develop esprit de corps among the group of long-term students through meetings, graduation ceremonies, news bulletins, and such devices. In some cases, where the central labor union or an education committee is heavily committed to the program, regular union channels also provide reinforcement.

What Impact?

As with most labor education programs, it is difficult to assess the impact of the long-term programs on students' thinking and activity. The only research project on this question is currently in process at Penn State University, financed in part by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. This study will compare two groups of unionists in the Lehigh Valley, one of which is taking the ULA program of courses; the other, a control group that is similarly motivated toward labor education but is not in the ULA program. The study is investigating changes in behavior, attitudes, aspitations, position within the labor movement, and job status among the members of the two groups over a two-year period, to see if significant differences develop between those who attend the ULA and those who do not. A study of ULA dropouts is also part of the project. Results of this study will probably not be available until 1969.

One of the questions facing those programs that have been in operation for some years is what to do with the students who have completed the long-term program and want to continue to study. Some, like the Rutgers program, feel that they should be channeled into regular college courses for credit, and they are working to make this possible. Ohio State and Roosevelt have taken a different tack: both have added a fourth year to their certificate program to enable interested students to continue. The Michigan-Wayne program is setting up a series of three sophisticated short courses during 1968-69, so that graduates of its program may continue if they wish.

Some Questions to be Answered

The long-term programs have added a new dimension to labor education in the last decade by providing courses that are deeper and broader in content. In the minds of those responsible for them, they are still in the experimental stage, with frequent changes in content, length, and materials. They vary so greatly in goals and content that it is difficult to generalize about them. In their present state of development, however, they raise a number of questions.

What kind of educational experience is a particular long-term program trying to provide? Is it a set of advanced courses for experienced unionists or is it a rounded series for everyone? Is it aimed largely at those who will complete the entire program or is it a set in which each course has value as a meaningful educational unit for an individual?

If the long-term aspect of a given program is important, what procedures, organization, and counseling are effective in getting students to complete the program? (In any event, better records and statistics would help us know the program retention rate.)

How does the long-term program in any area fit into the total pattern of labor education available to individual unionists? How does it relate to a union's needs as an institution? What is its relation to tool courses?

How do you build understanding and support for long-term programs among local labor officials and staff?

Related to goals and to the place of the long-term program in the total labor education picture is the question how much emphasis should the program put on the social sciences. How much on advanced tool courses? The humanities? Science?

Affecting the educational quality of the courses is the problem of finding good teachers and effective teaching materials. There is considerable agreement that more time and money should be put into preparing special materials keyed to unionists. Equally important is the attention paid to orienting teachers to labor students and to the program's purposes. Can university faculty be effective without adjusting the teaching style to the needs of worker-students?

If intellectual growth is one aim of the programs, what kind of help should be given students on reading and study skills? Possibly writing and speaking courses should be set up to improve students' ability to deal with the course content in their own terms.

Are fees for these programs too high? Should the program be expected to pay for itself (as is true with some programs) or should it be subsidized?

Special Projects

In recent years several of the university centers have conducted special projects financed by grants from foundations or from the government. These grants have enabled the centers to expand their traditional programs or to function in new fields. It is our purpose here to bring together various types of such projects, which are touched upon in the program descriptions of the universities involved.

Resident Training

One group of projects was intended to provide resident training for unionists in the traditional academic areas. The largest experiment of this type was that supported by the Fund for Adult Education through the National Institute of Labor Education. During 1961 and 1962 five ten-week schools concentrated on teaching the social sciences at the academic level to full-time union staff. The experiment was intended to test whether there was an interest in this type of education; whether union staff could be relieved from responsibility long enough to participate; and whether the instructors could make the social sciences meaningful to a group which was primarily task-oriented and had not been involved in academic education for some time if at all. Seventy-five unionists participated, most of them full-time staff; but the recruiting was so difficult that a sixth school that had been planned was not held. Most of the students regarded the experience as very successful. But there was difficulty in some institutions with the readings, in the organization of the material, and with the teaching practices. There has been no effort to continue this kind of education in the United States but the Canadian Labor College, established in 1963, has a somewhat similar goal for unionists in that country.

The other experiment in resident academic education for unionists was conducted by the University of Indiana for the Steelworkers. This was a program for rank-and-file unionists; originally it was developed in cooperation with the union's District 30, which has worked closely with the university for many years. The program was supported by the university, by grants from both the national union and the district, and by The Ford Foundation. Twelve-week sessions were held in 1963, 1964, and 1966, involving 61 unionists. Unionists from a few other districts of the Steelworkers' union were enrolled in the 1964 and 1966 courses.

The Indiana program was intended to find rank-and-file unionists who could be attracted to higher education through a favorable experience in general liberal education. The first students were recruited without regard to their union role on the basis of their ability to participate successfully in the program. In the latter two sessions the recruiting took more carefully into account the union responsibilities of the students, and the curriculum was shifted somewhat in the same direction while maintaining its general liberal arts orientation.

Both the union and the university were generally satisfied with the program as it was conducted. But both concluded that it was too expensive to be continued.

Expansion of Traditional Activities

A second group of projects, financed mostly by U.S. government grants, has also enabled university centers to expand education in the traditional areas. In this category would be the programs set up by Penn State, Iowa, West Virginia, Cornell, and Hawaii, with grants made under Title I of the Higher Education Act.

The Penn State project, now in its second year, involves the training and development of trade union specialists on community problems in two Pennsylvania communities, Harrisburg and Reading. The training is intended to enable the unionists to analyze specific problems in their communities and to work with the unions and other local forces to deal with them. The university works with the AFL-CIO community services staff in this project.

Iowa has used its Title I funds to begin a long-term nonresident program.

West Virginia used a small part of its Title I money to expand its existing long-term program. Most of the funds went to support a series of courses dealing thus far with state and local governmental problems. Renewal of the grant will make it possible to follow these with courses in intergroup relations and international affairs. Text materials have been prepared for all the courses.

Two Cornell programs in public employee bargaining were originally financed with grants from outside the university. Support was received from the New York State Education Department for work with school districts and employee organizations. The first programs were essentially informational, conducted through a series of conferences on the meaning of the state law and how to function under it. They drew school board members, school administrators, and representatives of employee organizations. Efforts are now being directed toward skill training, with the activities developed separately for more specific groups.

The public employee program directed to collective bargaining in other agencies of state and local government was started with a Title I grant and continued with a direct state appropriation. In this effort separate activities have been developed for management and labor groups. Inter-union short courses have made up the larger part of the labor work. There have been some courses and resident schools for selected unions and it is expected that this type of activity will expand. Independent associations have been greatly involved in these programs. Some research studies and conference reports have been prepared on some aspects of public employee bargaining that provide background material for teaching.

In Hawaii the Title I funds were used in part for the preparation of major teaching materials in a number of subjects. Some of the money was used for special courses in community problems.

Penn State has also had a state vocational education grant for a project relating to traditional labor education. This project provides for the training of trade unionists as instructors of steward training, in the hope that they will then be employed for this purpose in the adult or vocational education programs of their local school district. This would create a statewide resource of steward instructors. The project was originally conducted in Reading and Philadelphia, and a second grant made it possible to extend the training to other areas of the state. Instructors trained in this project have been used by some school districts, particularly Philadelphia in its special program, and by the UAW for some of its local union training. It is too soon to tell whether the original purposes of the project will be fulfilled.

Education in Special Content Areas

Finally, a number of projects have been financed by a grant for the education and training of unionists in what might be regarded as special areas. The Office of Economic Opportunity has made the largest single group of such grants: to Rutgers, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Penn State, with other grants pending.

The Rutgers project was the first. It involved the full-time training of persons drawn from the poverty community to work in agencies that deal with the problems of poverty. The trainees were selected generally from unions or civil rights organizations. The training consisted of a combination of class work and assignment to a community action agency. The first two groups, 20 in each, received a year's training; in the third year the training was reduced to six months and the size of the groups increased to 40. Since the trainees have been paid while learning it has not been difficult to recruit able people, many from the minorities. All of the graduates have been placed, some with community action agencies, others with unions. Rutgers has conducted a smaller project to train a few local unionists and community action staff members to develop projects to combat the problems of poverty. Eighteen people were involved in this program and they did develop some local projects.

The other OEO grants have had a quite different purpose: to train local unionists to function effectively in their own communities in the mobilization of local labor into the antipoverty effort; and to improve their own operation in the community effort to deal with poverty either through the local community action agency or some other antipoverty program.

The program at West Virginia was the first of these projects and served as the prototype for the others. It was set up jointly with the AFL-CIO Appalachian Trade Union Council, which is composed of the officers of the AFL-CIO state central bodies in the Appalachian area. Based in West Virginia, the project functions in all the Appalachian states except Pennsylvania, which has its own OEO training program.

In its initial phase the Appalachian Trade Union project trained about 100 local unionists selected by their AFL-CIO state central bodies in cooperation with local central bodies if any. There were four weeks of resident training, divided into one-week units. This program provided an understanding of the problems of poverty and the governmental efforts to deal with them through funds from various sources. Between sessions the trainees were assigned to specific projects in their home community relating to the objectives set forth earlier. In this work they had the assistance of a project field staff for consultation and guidance. The field staff also checked on the local efforts of the trainees. The trainees received wages for work-time lost during the learning period but they were not paid for their antipoverty work at home.

The results of the project were beyond expectation when tested by such measures as union involvement in the antipoverty program, the development of new community action agencies, union representation on such agencies, and the role of the trainees in developing new projects. A number of the graduates of the program have been employed in antipoverty programs developed by the Appalachian Trade Union Council and the West Virginia AFL-CIO Labor Federation.

The second phase of the Appalachian program has been to extend the educational effort to a new group of local unionists through statewide or regional conferences followed up by local training programs, either at conferences or in short courses. The project has been funded for a third year. It is expected that the current trainees will function in their local communities as did the original trainees.

While different in detail, the Massachusetts and Pennsylvania OEO projects have the same general purpose as that at West Virginia. The Massachusetts training program takes 150 unionists from the six New England States. It too has a field staff to work with the trainees locally as a follow-up of the resident training.

All these projects require a close working relationship between the staff and the state and local central bodies involved, since the trainee can only be effective to the extent that he or she is supported by the unions in the area.

The university center at Minnesota has also operated an OEO program but not directed to the training of unionists. The center received a contract for training VISTA workers in the hope that unionists would become involved so as to be of mutual benefit to the volunteers and to themselves. When this idea failed the center gave up further VISTA training. It is now working with an Equal Opportunity Program concerning job-placement for hard-core unemployed. The Minnesota center has worked with the unions to find jobs, and has trained unionists to act as volunteer counselors and to provide support for those who are placed.

UCLA has worked cooperatively with a Teamsters' job-training program by providing some training related to unionism, and in general giving consultation service. There has also been a relationship with the trade-union-sponsored programs in the Watts area.

The Michigan-Wayne center was the recipient of an OEO grant not related to the training of trade unionists but for a special program to work with a poverty community not far from Ann Arbor. Before the project was completed it became a political issue in that area which hampered the possibilities for success.

The other special programs are more varied, involving mental health at Roosevelt; juvenile delinquency at Massachusetts; and urban affairs in the Cornell Metropolitan New York district.

The Roosevelt mental health project was designed primarily for operation and research rather than education. It was a four-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health to test certain practices related to the treatment of workers' mental health problems. One part of the project did involve the conduct of 10 short courses on mental health for union members. The center also held a community conference on the mental health of workers.

The Massachusetts center received a grant from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency for a project lasting 18 months. It was intended to develop among unionists an understanding of the problems of juvenile delinquency and to find channels for unionists to work with public and private agencies in that field. The project was planned with the state AFL-CIO community services committee and worked closely with the local labor staff. The chief activities have been a statewide conference, followed by regional conferences and some local workshops. In some communities sufficient interest was developed to inspire the unionists to follow up on their own.

The Union-University Urban Affairs Program at Cornell is an outgrowth of interest aroused among unions by programs originally conducted by the center with funds from a Title I grant. The current project is supported by a grant from The Ford Foundation, union contributions, and Title I funds. It will consist of a variety of courses and seminars on urban problems, the placing of union interns in government departments, the preparation of material for courses and general use, and cooperation with union action groups on urban problems.

Joint Labor-Management Programs

Very little effort by the university centers goes into activities set up for both unions and employers. Traditionally, some of the centers attached to industrial relations institutes have been involved in annual conferences which appeal to both groups and deal with some major current issue in industrial relations. There may be other conferences on specific topics like arbitration, often conducted with the American Arbitration Association, or on the Taft-Hartley Act, conducted with a regional office of the National Labor Relations Board. The Metropolitan New York district of Cornell usually has some conferences like this each year.

The recent upsurge of public employee bargaining in state and local government has expanded the number of programs in which unionists and management are brought together. The Cornell public employee program in the field of education started with conferences for which both groups were recruited. As the programs developed, more specialized training has begun for unionists and management separately. The public employee activity at Wisconsin also involved some joint programs at the beginning.

There is no pressure on the centers for joint labor-management education, so it is unlikely that this will be a factor in their future development.

Research and Education

In a number of cases a labor education center is based in a division of a university which also has a research function. Some of these centers, and some other centers as well, expect some research work from the labor education staff. We sought to learn whether this research is pertinent to education and, if so, whether it is responsible for materials that are useful to labor educators. We also had an interest in whether any of the research is directed to the problems of labor education.

Most center administrators felt that most of the academic research around the problems of workers is irrelevant to the education programs or, when this is not the case, the published results are difficult for most instructors to use. The exception seems to be the academic who is attached to an extension program as a content specialist and who uses his own research results in his teaching. Other academics who have conducted research that is useful in education will often teach some courses incorporating their findings, but will lose interest in these as their research interests shift. In most cases, however, this has not produced generally available permanent materials.

Those administrators who are interested in the problem suggest two ways to provide some immediate results, both of which involve a much closer relationship between research and extension education than is customary in academic institutions. One is the special project which directs the research toward educational use, or the attachment of a research specialist to the staff whose primary concern is to provide background material for teaching. The second is action research directed to some current union need, around the results of which education can be developed. There are examples of both of these.

The Cornell public employee projects have turned out a series of short studies of special problems in state and local government bargaining. They have also attracted the research interests of some of the academic faculty for more thorough studies. Connecticut and Massachusetts have added research specialists who have, as one responsibility, the preparation of materials on state legislation and other state problems which can be integrated into the courses.

Most examples of action research come from the centers in California. Both of them work with the California Council for Health Plan Alternatives, which is concerned with more effective use of union-negotiated health and welfare plans. Research at UCLA aided in the development of the Teamsters' job-training program and the initiation of the labor program in Watts. Berkeley is conducting a study of developments in the construction industry in the Bay Area as they affect carpenters. The study is used as the basis for conferences with leaders of the union. There was also one program at Indiana which fits this category, a study of membership attitudes in Fort Wayne, which led to two courses for young union members.

There are also some examples of research on the problems of labor education. Much of this has been directed to evaluation, and will be discussed in detail in that section of the report. The major project is located at Penn State and involves students in the long-term program, but there have been others at Ohio State, Indiana, Cornell, and West Virginia. Penn State is also engaged in a detailed study of the participants in all its programs and is making a study of attitudes of the younger members of the Steelworkers that will be used by the union in the development of an education program.

Center Structure and Staffing

The administrative relations of labor education centers to their universities are now so varied that it is impossible to generalize. They range from the center at Roosevelt, for example, which has equal status with the university's other schools, to a division of an ad hoc organization such as the industrial relations center supported by two universities, Michigan and Wayne. Even when the administrative structure seems the same the practices may differ. Some centers in extension divisions are held rigidly to the extension regulations. Others have flexibility. Nor does the fact that a center is part of a labor-management institute automatically determine the character of its operations. Like extension divisions, the institutes differ greatly from university to university. In some universities the institute's location gives status to the labor education center; in others it may hamper the development of programs.

The administrative structure for each center is noted in the program descriptions; the information is not repeated here.

Our investigation indicates that from the standpoint of effective development of labor education there is no one right location that will apply to all universities. In any given university the location of the center is of extreme importance, but that does not mean that the same administrative relationship in another university will work out the same way. Rather, there are certain conditions that are important to the development of labor education which may be achieved differently in different institutions.

Before considering these conditions it is important to point out that university labor education suffers because it is an extension activity. There is no need to document here the general attitude in most universities toward extension education. With the exception of agriculture, the discrimination against extension is more than attitude. In many state universities the extension division must pay its own way, including administration. There is rarely academic rank or tenure within the division. Extension activities are not regarded equally with academic research in obtaining advancement. This attitude toward extension is one of the factors that have motivated some center administrators to seek an academic side to their programs or an academic base in the university, or to involve their staff in academic teaching. But labor education will continue to be primarily an extension activity and will have to live with that fact.

Within this framework the conditions that make it easier to develop effective labor education are these: an administration sympathetic to labor education; full responsibility for program development in the center; flexibility in budgeting, including control over program charges and fees to ad hoc instructors; flexibility in hiring permanent staff as well as ad hoc instructors; and the freedom of the staff to work on labor education without undue involvement in academic teaching and research. To these should be added academic rank and tenure which is now a major factor of staff morale in many centers.

In selecting its top administrators no university will consider attitude toward labor education as a factor. But the attitude is important. The administrative problem for labor educators is how the needs of the center can best be interpreted to the decision makers. Some center directors have found it best to have direct access, if not to the president at least to a high administrative figure. Others feel they get best results from reporting to a dean in a strong university position who can fight their battles for them. This situation varies among universities and may also change within a single university when top administration changes.

Few centers now have administrative difficulty making their own program decisions within the general framework of the operation. Years ago this was a problem in some centers when faculty committees were involved in determining program emphasis. In some instances there was also concern that the university might be somehow involved in union indoctrination. Over the years university administrators have lost this fear. They have also recognized that labor education specialists are the best judges of the state of the market, so to speak, and should be trusted to function on the basis of their specialization. A sharp break with past practice or the start of a major new activity should be expected to go beyond the center for final approval.

There are greater difficulties with flexibility in the use of funds. A few centers still operate on a rigid budget, prepared in advance, which can be deviated from only under great administrative difficulty. Such stringency restricts program development in response to interest by a new organization or in a new type of program. Sometimes the budgeting is accompanied by a requirement that income from program activity be returned to the university's general fund or to the extension division. In such cases the center is unable to conduct a new program that would pay for itself. Most centers have resolved this problem to permit the use of program income within the center.

Another problem arises when the center is required to set charges the same as those in general extension, which usually means that they be high enough to return all out-of-pocket costs and often include a percentage for administrative overhead. It is this formula which is responsible for such high charges at some university centers as to interfere with program development; it has also encouraged some centers to concentrate on inter-union programs, which allow the costs to be spread among many individuals or unions. Two long-established centers have been able to eliminate this requirement in recent years, but it is still a problem in some recently established centers. It would seem that the best time to avoid the troublesome restriction is at the outset.

Labor educators often like to have the prestige of academic teaching; but some universities have made regular teaching and other academic responsibilities such as research or student counseling a requirement for labor education staff. Experience would indicate that the labor education program suffers as a result, particularly during the center's developmental period. The staff is tied to the campus when it should be reaching out to potential clientele. Conscientious teaching and research take time from program development. One fairly new center lost its staff and foundered over this issue, and is only now getting back into operation after a year's hiatus. In addition, the requirement that the labor education staff teach academic courses restricts employment to those who meet the standards for an academic appointment. In two fairly new centers this meant hiring directors completely inexperienced in labor education, with consequent program difficulties.

University Labor Education Staff

This brings us to the question of who gets hired as staff for university labor education centers. Almost all the present directors have higher academic degrees or are in the process of acquiring them. A few have a bachelor's degree, and one is not a college graduate. Some who are now directors came to that position after academic training, generally in labor economics, and developed labor education expertise on the job. Others took subordinate positions in university centers after their academic training and have risen to their present posts in the same institution or have moved to another. Finally there are some directors who, in addition to their academic training, have had union experience, usually but not always in a professional capacity.

All the directors say they like to hire staff who have a combination of academic training and union experience but that such people are not easy to find. Two universities have hired staff without an academic degree, equating the union experience with the college training. A number hire those without advanced degrees if they have sufficient union experience. But some directors start by looking for an M.A., if they can find one, and others press the newly hired employees to obtain an M.A. One university wants a Ph.D. with union experience, but only rarely finds one. It has hired Ph.D.'s without union or labor education experience as well as some unionists who were then encouraged to study for a doctorate. Another university also tries to find a Ph.D. or a candidate willing to get one.

Center administrators who look for staff with academic training claim it enables them to feel more at home in the university and makes advancement easier. This is the argument of a university that wants staff with doctorates. Some administrators also say that the higher academic training provides for greater content competence.

The current pressure for academic rank and tenure for university labor education staff encourages the trend to require higher academic degrees. It is among those universities in which rank and tenure are already established that there is the greatest insistence on advanced degrees. Given the present structure of American universities it is natural that labor educators should desire the status and security of rank and tenure. Yet few labor education administrators are in a strong enough position to break the traditional standards for achieving rank and tenure, even though they may feel that the standards are false as applied to labor education. Those who are successful in equating union experience with education for rank and tenure as well as for hiring will have the greatest flexibility in finding competent staff.

Financing

We had hoped to use a survey conducted by the University Labor Education Association as a basis for ascertaining the sources of support for university labor education and calculating the amount of money spent. Unfortunately, the information for many institutions did not distinguish labor education expenses from other expenditures and it seemed impossible to identify the amounts involved. In addition, the survey was incomplete, omitting a number of the centers, and we saw no purpose in reporting partial and uncertain information.

Relations with the Unions

There is no intention to review here the adjustments that took place in the relationship between universities and unions during the period of rapid growth of university labor education centers. The change is adequately described in the Kerrison, Barbash, and Mire books noted in the first chapter of this report. Out of that experience have come certain practices which are now generally accepted. In 1962 these practices were formalized in a joint statement resulting from a meeting of union and university labor educators. The statement is reprinted here as Appendix IV.

In this section we shall examine two of the formal practices. The first is a relationship between the university and the unions through an advisory committee, usually only for labor education but sometimes for other center activities, particularly research. The second and more important from the standpoint of day-to-day operations is the acceptance of the principle of joint planning for specific programs between the center and the labor group involved. We shall see how the university and union educators react to these ideas in practice. We shall also explore their reactions to the issue of division of function in labor education between unions and universities.

Labor Advisory Committees

All the centers now have labor advisory committees. In the two national programs with special purposes, Harvard and Brookings, the committees consist of high officials of national unions. Roosevelt also has a national as well as a local committee but the national committee does not function. The other center advisory committees generally represent the state labor movement. The committee is formally selected by the university, but in most cases the selection is based on nominations by the state AFL-CIO, sometimes after consultation between the state AFL-CIO and the center staff. At Cornell, Rutgers, and Illinois, the laws establishing industrial relations institutions of which the centers are a part provide for union representation on the over-all governing board. These boards, however, have not served in an advisory capacity on labor education, although some of the members have been involved with the center. There are several state universities with labor education centers that have trade unionists on the university governing board. In two states these unionists have a close continuing relationship with the center. Most others support the center when needed, but a few seem to have no interest at all.

In some states the advisory committee represents the union power structure; in others it is a combination of power structure and unions with a particular interest in education. Most of the union members of committees are officers of a central body and regional staff of national unions. However, about half the committees also include regional education staff of national unions and national union education directors, particularly if the national union headquarters are within the state. A few centers include members who are on the staff of the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

Center administrators generally agree that the advisory committees were important in the early days of the program as a symbol of union approval and as a channel to the individual unions. In most of the established centers this is no longer necessary. Most administrators say that at present the primary function of the committee is to support the center within the university in requests for funds and staff and to prevent university interference in the center's development of its own program. In about half the centers the committee also serves to interpret union needs and attitudes to the academics and administrators who represent the university at the meetings and in turn to help the unionists understand the university. In a few instances the committee provides an opportunity for the critical testing of plans for new programs. The feeling in most centers, however, is that the union members of the committee will approve nearly all the plans that are put before them. Finally, in a few centers the administrators feel that the committees really do not work at all. This is likely to happen in large industrial states where the official state labor movement has a very limited interest in education and where the unions that do have an interest can work well on their own programs directly with the center.

In general, the committees regarded as functioning most effectively are those made up of representatives of unions interested in education, often including union education professionals. Center administrators feel that the committees could meet their responsibilities more effectively if they did include more union educators, particularly those with broad experience who could make judgments about the use of resources. Some administrators are bothered by committees who do no work at all or who sometimes simply get in the way. But most administrators who can get support from the unionists when they need it, either through the committee or individually, seem satisfied.

Union educators continue to press for advisory committees, but no longer have the high hopes indicated in the joint statement referred to earlier in this section. Some of the unionists we interviewed feel that some center administrators would rather not have committees that are too effective and do not put major issues before them. In the early 1960's the AFL-CIO Department of Education conducted a series of regional meetings for union members of advisory committees intended primarily to broaden their experience and give them an understanding of their total function. This provided a spurt of interest which has since subsided.

Program Planning

The great majority of university labor education activities are planned with local unions and central labor unions. For these it is the center which provides the educational expertise while the union indicates the need. Center staff feel that there is little difference between working with locals of unions with a strong national education program and working with the others, but they agree that the sophistica- of local leadership does make a difference. Only rarely will union headquarters staff participate in planning local union activity. Some say they would like reports of center programs conducted with their locals.

University centers work with national unions in planning staff training, one-week schools, and some regional conferences. It is here that the principle of joint planning is put to the test, since there are education professionals representing both groups. The reaction from both union and university labor educators indicate that the stronger the union education department, the more difficulties arise. The university educators want to have a share in making educational decisions--not, as they say, only to provide a hotel and some teachers. Union educators, on the other hand, feel that they understand the educational needs of the group and have the professional competence to develop a program to meet them. The problem is particularly difficult when a union brings part of a nationwide program to the university center.

In general, therefore, those union educators who feel that their national programs are highly integrated into the unions--among them the Meat Cutters, the Rubber Workers, ACWA, and ILGWU--only occasionally turn to the university centers for assistance or else work out a close relationship with one university in which they feel comfortable for certain types of programs.

Most union educators expressed satisfaction over their relations with university centers. A few felt that costs are rising to an uneconomic level, and there was occasional criticism of the teaching quality and the unwillingness of some university instructors to relate to the students in on-campus programs outside the hours spent in class.

Division of Function Between Unions and Universities

Nearly all labor educators agreed that the need for labor education is so far from being met that it is unrealistic to talk about a division of function between universities and unions; rather, they felt that stress should be placed on the most effective use of existing resources. All but a very few would accept the traditional view that unions should provide the basic tool training and the education directed toward developing loyalty within an organization; and that the universities should help train unionists for this work, experiment in all areas of labor education, and develop academically related programs such as those in the social sciences.

But most union educators and nearly all of those at universities agreed that there was so little union tool training locally that the universities should meet expressed needs in this as well as in the other areas indicated above. A few university labor educators felt that the universities could bring a sophistication to basic tool training that is worthwhile, and some from both unions and universities said that the universities had an advantage in dealing with controversial subjects. In contrast, there were some union educators who wanted the unions to assume responsibility for all the education and training that relates to the union as an institution, turning to the universities for what was called "enrichment" education for the individual members. At least one center administrator would welcome this, for he feels that the university should not relate to the union as an institution but rather stimulate the unionists into thinking about the problems of society.

Use of Resources

Every university labor education center is short of staff and funds. This limitation forces an allocation of existing resources that requires a conscious decision about priorities, sometimes verbalized, sometimes taken for granted.

Spread Through the State

Whatever the priorities in types of activity, there is one question that faces all state university centers: Will they try to provide service throughout the state and, if so, how? There are a few states small enough--Connecticut and New Jersey, for example--so that this question does not arise. In other states the problem varies between those like Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New York, where the university is isolated from major population centers, and most others where the problem is to reach the isolated communities with union members.

For some centers the problem is clearly unsolved. Aside from Fort Wayne, Indiana leaves untouched the state's major industrial centers in the north. Iowa conducts a very small program away from the campus, and hardly any of that is to the west. The Los Angeles area is so heavily populated that UCLA rarely takes activity to other sections of southern California. In these centers it might be said that limited resources are used where it is easiest to use them.

The most common method of spreading service through the state is to divide the staff. Cornell has district offices throughout the state, with a major staff in the New York Metropolitan area. Penn State also has district offices. Illinois, after years of concentration outside of Chicago, has now placed staff at the university branch there. Other centers also have staff in university branches: Minnesota in Duluth, Massachusetts in Boston, and Wisconsin in Milwaukee. Michigan State has used a somewhat different procedure by establishing joint programs with Oakland University in Pontiac and Western Michigan in Kalamazoo.

The development of regional offices helps but does not completely solve the problem unless staff is willing to travel. Wisconsin will conduct short courses or conferences anywhere in the state, its instructors driving several hundred miles a day to do this. The West Virginia staff travels from Morgantown to the more industrialized sections of the state. Michigan State staff still travel north from Lansing. But travel creates its own problems. Few labor educators enjoy it enough to keep it up year after year. As staff becomes stabilized, continuous travel is almost a punishment for those who must do it, and center administrators are concerned about finding some alternative method of providing education in distant communities.

The long-term programs that concentrate on the social sciences are seen as one answer, since instructors can come from nearby academic institutions to teach the courses. In that case only the administrator travels, and not every week. Short conferences are another response because they concentrate the travel. Some administrators consider the possibility of developing expertise for basic training in the network of community colleges that are springing up in their states. It is too soon to know whether this can be worked out. One conclusion seems certain: education in the untouched geographic areas will come from increasing the center staffs or finding new resources. Few groups which have been cooperating with centers over the years seem ready to give up their programs so that others may be served.

What Educational Emphasis?

A second question of program priorities for university centers arises over the varying emphases on what might be regarded as the dual goals of labor education: service to the union as a democratic institution in a democratic society; and the provision of educational opportunities to the individual unionist that encourage personal development. All labor educators accept both these goals; every program offered has some of each as its objective.

Yet there are obvious differences in the way various centers use their resources. A large number organize all, or almost all, of their activity in close cooperation with individual unions or central bodies, seeking to provide courses and conferences that are geared to institutional needs. Individual development, in a sense, is a by-product of this service-oriented education. Opportunities for individual development grow as the union interests broaden, and as the education becomes more advanced, but the university works closely with the union at all times in program development.

At the opposite extreme are those who feel that the university function is to concentrate on education directed to the unionist as an individual, the institutional needs being served as a result of individual development. This was the rationale behind the concentration on a long-term program focusing on the social sciences at Ohio State when the center there was first established.

As is noted in the section dealing with long-term programs, some of them attempt to meet the unions' institutional needs by including tool courses such as collective bargaining or union administration, but by its very nature the long-term program is expected to attract those already motivated toward education. Education focused more directly on union needs may reach many whose immediate concern is to obtain help in day-to-day union work. If the tool courses are well taught they will provide the motivation for further education for many who would not otherwise have it.

The ideal solution for labor education would be a broad base of courses meeting the immediate institutional needs of unionists out of which would flow two streams. One would be more sophisticated institutional training, some of which would deal with broad subjects, particularly social problems. The other would be very similar to the best of the long-term programs now, using the concerns of unionism as a base on which to educate for individual development. Credit courses leading to an associate or a baccalaureate degree with a major in labor studies could be the next step in this direction.

If there were larger educational resources in the unions and universities, such a pattern might well develop. But resources are limited. A few centers do try to maintain a balance, expanding their short courses, mostly institution-oriented, while they conduct long-term programs. But, up to now at least, a choice is made in most centers, and one or the other program receives the support. However, the situation is still changing. Some centers that have been oriented primarily toward the short course are starting long-term programs, and others that have used almost all their resources for long-term programs are talking about more courses directed to union training. It is too soon to know whether most centers will achieve a balance between the two kinds of programs. The number of credit courses and degree programs is still too few to know what impact they will have on other types of labor education.

How Many Special Programs?

The programs for intensive training in a special subject such as poverty, urban affairs, or juvenile delinquency raise another question in relation to center resources. Will this involvement distort program emphasis and restrict the growth of more traditional programs? An examination of the activity of the centers that have conducted such programs indicates that this fear is not justified. The special programs have provided for staff expansion, and administrative judgment thus far has ensured that most program areas are related to labor education. There is an important positive value because most of these programs offer education on social problems that unionists might otherwise ignore. It may be that the test of the university center will be its ability to continue education in these fields when the outside financing has ceased.

Footnotes

1/ Labor Education Center, University of Connecticut, expects to start an experimental program in one city in 1968; N.Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, will initiate a two-year program in New York City in the fall of 1968; The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations of the University of Illinois began a program in one downstate city in spring, 1968, and expects to extend it to others. This program differs from the ILIR long-term program in Chicago.

2/ John McCollum, "Union Leadership Program, University of Chicago," in *Reorientation in Labor Education*, Freda H. Goldman, ed. (Chicago, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962), pp. 77, 79.

3/ Anne L. Gould, "Liberal Arts for Labor, The University of California," in *Reorientation in Labor Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

4/ S. C. Kelley, "The University and Labor Education," *Labor Education Viewpoints*, Issue No. 6 (Bethesda, Md., Workers' Education Local 189, AFT-AFL-CIO, Spring 1962), p. 4.

5/ Irvine L. H. Kerrison and Herbert A. Levine, *Labor Leadership Education* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1960), p. 37.

6/ Wells Keddie, Proposal for Research on "An Evaluation of the Impact of the Union Leadership Academy on the Occupational and Citizenship Roles of Unionists," submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education by Penn State University in August 1966, p. 1.

CHAPTER VI

OTHER INSTITUTIONS IN LABOR EDUCATION

Catholic Labor Education

In the 1940's Catholic labor education programs reached a considerable number of union members in the large cities. Since that time there has been a steady decline. During the survey period of 1965 and 1966 there were nine Catholic programs running regular, continuous schools, and one program that conducted a course regularly each spring. 1/ In addition to the ten programs 2/ identified in the course of the survey, there are occasional classes given by Catholic colleges which formerly had regular programs.

The nine major programs still in existence are night schools, a format common to adult education and labor education in the twenties and thirties. Students come to a building in the central city one night a week and take two or three short classes a night. Unlike other labor education programs today, the Catholic schools draw students from unions, management, and the public. During 1966, enrollment in the ten programs discussed in this chapter was about 3,100 students, according to the estimates given by their directors.

While Catholic labor education dates back to 1911, significant activity really began in the 1940's and most of the present programs were founded then. Throughout the forties, the number of programs grew rapidly, out of concern over Communist influence in the labor movement and a general sympathy with unionism as well as a recognition of the need for training leaders in the newly organized industrial unions. Internal democracy was also an issue of concern in some unions. By the middle of the decade there were 24 labor schools associated with Catholic colleges or universities; 64 schools sponsored by parishes or diocesan institutions; 5 forums conducted much like labor schools; and 5 labor institutes. 3/ The total enrollment was 7,500 students a year. Most of the labor schools attached to colleges were affiliated with the Jesuit Institute of Social Order in St. Louis. 4/

During the 1950's, Catholic labor programs declined sharply, and by 1955 there were only 35 or 40. 5/ Various reasons for the decline are given by the heads of programs still in existence: the fading threat of Communist domination after the CIO expelled the Communists in 1949; the rise of urban universities offering similar training to labor; the increasing number of unions with their own education programs; and the move to the suburbs by unionists. In the 1960's Catholic activists became interested in civil rights and poverty problems rather than labor, and this further contributed to the decline.

The ten programs that have continued seem to reflect the interest of dedicated individuals, some of whom have been heading labor education programs for 20 years or more. These priests are well known to both labor and management in their communities; several of them are recognized arbitrators, and often they are called upon for informal mediation or support in labor disputes. Their long-standing identification with labor causes is an important basis for the success of their programs.

Another factor that has probably contributed to the continuation of the programs discussed here, despite the over-all decline, is that a number of them are located in cities where no other group offers basic inexpensive tool courses for unionists, and thus the Catholic schools fill a need.

The sponsorship of the centers is diverse, as it was in the past. Six of the present programs are loosely attached to colleges established by the Jesuits; one is attached to a diocesan institution; two are carried on under the auspices of archdioceses; and one is conducted by a trade-union group that is largely Catholic.

The philosophical basis of the programs comes from the Papal Encyclicals on labor and the social order. Implicit in the courses is the ethical and moral basis of human activity, including relations between labor and management. In a number of schools students are encouraged or required to take a course in social ethics.

The approach of these programs is illustrated by the Fall 1967 announcement of classes issued by the School of Industrial Relations sponsored by the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston:

> "This school is open to all, men and women, members of unions, management and others who are interested in furthering sound labor-management relations based on Christian Social Principles. Enrollment is not restricted to Catholics. All are welcome who subscribe to those principles or are sincerely interested in learning what they are. There are no specific educational qualifications; no examinations are held."

Most of the Catholic programs similarly welcome both labor and management to their classes, but in actual practice from 60 percent to 95 percent of the students are unionists. Most of them are local union officers and stewards, plus some newly active members. The management students come mainly from the lower ranks of management: they are foremen, supervisors, and personnel workers. In addition there is usually a sprinkling of interested individuals from the general public such as teachers and government workers.

A number of the programs have found it difficult to recruit management, although some of them see great value in joint classes and make a special effort to attract management personnel. St. Joseph's Institute of Industrial Relations in Philadelphia, for example, puts great stress on the exchange of views between both sides and gets about 35 percent of its students from local management. Other programs feel that the need is greater among unionists, since management has more opportunities for training in regular academic programs. The Catholic Labor Institute in Los Angeles, which is run by a group of trade unionists, is interested only in providing inexpensive tool courses for unionists. The Boston program is sponsored by a Labor Guild, which is a continuing organization of trade unionists with monthly meetings, occasional social affairs, and a monthly newsletter for members. The Xavier Institute of Industrial Relations in New York City is another program that is concerned mainly with developing labor leadership.

The unionists attending these programs come from a wide variety of both craft and industrial unions. One of the few detailed breakdowns available, from the Labor-Management School at the University of San Francisco, shows 221 labor students during the spring and fall terms of 1966, from about 40 different international unions. These unionists came from the building and printing trades, the Teamsters, the Longshoremen, and from a wide variety of industrial unions. Another breakdown, from an eight-week collective bargaining course conducted in the spring of 1966 by the Institute of Social Education of St. John College in Cleveland, in cooperation with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, shows a registration of 244 students from 57 locals of 21 international unions and three employee associations.

Tool courses are the mainstay of the programs--public speaking, collective bargaining, labor law, pension funds, parliamentary procedure, and grievance training. In addition, most of the schools offer courses in economics, labor history, and usual one or two forums in current labor problems or new social issues. Six of the programs also give a course in ethics, usually taught by the priest who heads the school, and explained in one typical brochure, from the Xavier Institute of Industrial Relations in New York City, as "discussion of current labor-relations problems with answers suggested from the ancient tradition and up-to-date thinking."

Except for Cleveland, all the nine programs give courses in an evening school located in a college or school building in the downtown city area. Most of them operate only one evening a week, and students select two or three classes for that evening. In addition to the evening school in Buffalo, the Labor Management College of the Diocese of Buffalo conducts eight-week evening schools once a year in several outlying towns in the diocese, but it is the only program that moves its classes beyond the home city.

Teachers for the courses come from the priests who head the schools, the faculty of the sponsoring college if there is one, and from community leaders, most of them Catholic laymen. The majority of the classes are taught by this latter group, which includes local union officers and staff, personnel directors and other executives, lawyers, and government officials from state and federal agencies.

These teachers are paid little or nothing for their services, with one exception where the teachers receive $60 per term. Since most of the schools have small budgets, teachers' volunteer service helps keep fees down. Fees are set fairly low, and are waived if necessary, in order not to discourage students. A number of schools, however, ask a registration fee to indicate seriousness of purpose. In five schools there are registration fees of $5 to $10; and in five others there are tuition charges per course of $5 to $15. In some cases these fees are paid by the student's local union.

Except for the Catholic Labor Institute in Los Angeles, each school is headed by a priest, often with the aid of one assistant. Some of the schools have an advisory council or sponsors, usually individuals from labor, management, and government. Members of the advisory group also teach in the program from time to time. While the general organization of the schools is fairly similar, each of the programs has a strong personality at its head and this individual's thinking affects the program's emphasis.

The Philadelphia program at St. Joseph's Institute of Industrial Relations, for example, puts considerable emphasis on labor-management relations and is the most academic of the programs. The Institute has a three-year program, culminating in a certificate for students who have attended six courses each semester and passed examinations. Courses follow an integrated and graded progression, and students must take two-thirds of their work in the more philosophical studies such as Democratic Ideals, Philosophy of Collective Bargaining, Rights and Duties, and The Law of Industrial Relations. The head of this Institute estimates that about 30 students graduate from the three-year program each spring. While several other programs give long-term certificates or medals, none of the rest have the rigorous program of St. Joseph's.

The various programs, like those in labor education generally, respond to needs and problems in their localities. Several of them have offered bargaining courses for public employees. One center, St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations in Jersey City, sponsors special courses occasionally for individual unions that request them. A few programs have set up courses in Spanish or classes aimed at Spanish-speaking workers. In New Orleans, where the Labor Management Center of the Institute of Human Relations of Loyola University has been providing an integrated program and drawing about 25 percent of its attendance from Negroes, several courses on legal and consumer problems have been offered. On the whole, church activity on poverty and minority problems is not carried on through the labor education centers, except as it touches union problems directly.

Since the Catholic programs are now some of the few left in labor education that are not institutionalized in unions or universities, it is interesting to speculate on their future. So long as there are interested and concerned individuals, present programs will probably continue; but younger activists in the church are more interested in poverty and civil rights problems, and in only a few of the centers are there now assistants who could carry on when present heads retire. Some present directors mention the difficulties of recruiting from the central city where their schools are located, and if university labor education programs expand in these city areas, a continued decline in Catholic programs seems probable.

Public Libraries and Unions

The public library has long been a resource for individual workers who sought to improve themselves or to understand the society in which they lived. Those who have been active in labor education constantly meet trade unionists who have educated themselves by reading, often with the guidance of a concerned librarian. Yet the evidence indicates that such workers are the exception and that over the years workers as a group have used libraries far less than have the more affluent members of society. Until comparatively recently there was little effort by librarians to cultivate workers as library users. 6/

Individual librarians have long been aware of this gap in their service to the community, and some of them saw the unions, and particularly labor education activities, as a natural channel for reaching workers to acquaint them with the opportunities that libraries can provide. By the early 1940's several libraries had set up special programs directed toward unionists. Even though they found the going difficult, there was sufficient response to prompt the American Library Association to establish in 1945 the Joint Committee on Library Service to Labor Groups, which later became a subcommittee of the Adult Services Division of the ALA. From the beginning the Committee included representatives of unions as well as librarians, and it had the endorsement of both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This support continued after the merger of the union federations in 1955, and the Committee is now made up of nine librarians and nine unionists. 7/

The Joint Committee describes its general objectives as follows: "to bring about closer understanding and cooperation between libraries and unions, and to encourage union members to make better use of their libraries." 8/ It justifies a library service to trade unions by pointing out that public libraries seek to serve all groups; that they serve other groups with special programs; that labor is a subject area; that the library is particularly suited to help unions in their concern with social problems; and, finally, that many unionists have limited experience with library materials and need special guidance. 9/

The Committee meets twice yearly, in conjunction with ALA meetings, to discuss mutual problems and to develop cooperative programs. At each ALA Annual Conference at least one open meeting is arranged that is devoted to some aspect of labor-library cooperation. These have been well attended by interested librarians and have attracted some trade unionists in addition to those serving on the Committee. The Committee published a semiannual newsletter entitled Library Services to Labor, which is mailed to members of the ALA Adult Services Division and to interested trade unionists.

A number of individual publications have been issued. The most popular of these is a guide entitled "Developing Library Services to Labor Groups," first issued in 1956. The 1967 edition contains a statement of the reasons for developing special library services for unions; suggestions for establishing effective contact between librarians and unionists; brief descriptions of various services that have proved successful; a resource section that includes lists of books, statistical sources, periodicals, and similar information; and a fairly extensive reading list of books on various aspects of labor problems. As a result of the Committee's work, the AFL-CIO has published and distributed a pamphlet entitled "Your Library Can Serve Your Union," urging unionists to take the initiative in making effective use of libraries.

In 1963 the Committee sponsored the publication of a book called Library Service to Labor, made up of a collection of articles from the ALA journal, the newsletter, and other sources dealing with various aspects of cooperation between libraries and unions and containing interpretive comments by the editors, Mrs. Dorothy Kuhn Oko and Bernard F. Downey, both experienced in this field.

In an effort to assess the extent and character of library services to labor, in 1967 the Committee developed a brief questionnaire that was mailed to approximately 950 public libraries in the United States with annual book funds over $10,000. Since the information sought was in line with the purposes of the present study, we undertook to tabulate the returns of the library survey.

Of the approximately 950 questionnaires distributed, 384 usable ones were returned. An additional 17 came back from libraries that were so specialized that the questions were not meaningful. While the returns included most centers of union activity in the United States, some of these (Detroit, for example) did not respond. Seventy-eight returns came from librarians who reported that there were no unions, or that they did not know of unions, in the geographic area they served.

More than half (156) of the 306 librarians reporting knowledge of unions in their geographic area said they had had contact with unions. Obviously this same proportion cannot be projected to the total number of libraries that received the questionnaire, since those who are actually working with unions are far more likely to respond. Since some libraries that we know do work with unions but did not respond, we cannot assume that 156 represents the total number of libraries cooperating with unions, although it may be close to the total.

What kind of activities do these libraries conduct? Question 11 listed eight common programs and allowed space for written additions. Two of the additions appeared often enough to establish separate categories. An examination of Table VI-1 indicates that very few libraries conduct a great variety of activities with unions. As might be expected, far the most common is reference service. Book displays are often related to National Library Week or Labor Day. A number of the book deposits and book lists are in conjunction with labor education classes or conferences. So are the film services.

A special examination was made of two categories of returns: the ten largest cities reporting, and 25 medium-sized communities with strong labor movements. The large-city libraries do provide a considerable variety of services, with the exception of Brooklyn, which in a sense competes with a long-established program in the New York Public Library. In these communities there seems to be a continuing relationship between the libraries and the unions that may reflect itself in special services like the joint sponsorship of a labor education conference in Philadelphia or the development of a list of community labor education resources in New York. Three of these libraries reported that they have a special person assigned to work with unions, but the programs in some of the cities reporting no such person were equally broad. It may be that in some of the latter cities there is a special interest in work with unions, even though there is no special staff.

Table VI-1

TYPES OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY LIBRARIES TO UNIONS

Service	A 1/	B 2/	C 3/	Total
Book discussion	1	1	9	11
Booktalk	3	3	16	22
Book deposits	5	4	14	23
Book display	9	8	40	57
Films	8	6	25	39
Reference	8	15	70	93
Pre- or post-retirement programs	2	4	0	6
Open house	0	0	10	10
Booklists	8	8	12	28
Articles in Labor Press	0	3	2	5

1/ Ten largest industrial cities.
2/ Twenty-five typical medium-sized industrial cities.
3/ All other libraries working with unions.

The 25 moderate-sized "union" communities reflect a greater variation. Reference service is the only activity carried on by a majority of them. The possibilities for cooperative effort in such communities are reflected in the programs in such cities as St. Paul; Minneapolis; Akron, Ohio; and Madison, Wisconsin. The St. Paul library reports book displays, films, reference service, book lists, talks on library service at union groups, articles for the labor press, the development of a labor leader's guide to library resources, programs for senior citizens, cooperation in union-sponsored counseling classes on consuming and pre-retirement, and a weekly bookmobile service to industrial plants. St. Paul does have a person assigned to work with unions. Minneapolis and Madison report almost as much activity as St. Paul, even though they have no one assigned specifically to work with unions. Akron has a long-established program with a special staff member assigned and has developed some interesting activities: working with mutes, for example. These four cities have active labor movements, but so do Oakland, California, and New Haven, Connecticut, which both report very limited cooperation with unions. Neither of the latter cities has active labor education programs.

One hundred twenty-one other libraries reported some work with unions. Most of these provided reference service, and about a third had book displays. The incidence of activity dropped off very sharply for other services.

There is no way of contrasting the present extent of cooperative activity with that in the past. Knowledgeable observers indicate that library work with unions is expanding, although they will also mention some programs that are not so extensive as they were in the past. 10/ In a study of labor education published in 1956, Joseph Mire reported that only a dozen libraries provided continuing service to labor in any form. 11/ Obviously the number of libraries in that category is much larger now. Twenty-two libraries reported that they had a staff member assigned specifically to work with unions. Seventy-two indicated that they had taken the initiative in contacting unions for cooperation. These actions indicate a desire for continuing programs of some kind.

Question 10 sought to find out who initiated the contact between the libraries and unions. It is interesting to note (see Table VI-2) that in most of the larger cities both unions and librarians seemed to be aware of the possibilities, while in the selected medium-sized "union" centers the initiative came primarily from the librarians.

Table VI-2

INITIATIVE FOR CONTACT BETWEEN LIBRARIES AND UNIONS

Source	A 1/	B 2/	C 3/	Total
Library	3	15	54	72
Union	1	2	42	45
Both	6	5	17	28
No answer	0	3	6	9
Don't know	0	0	2	2
	10	25	121	156

1/ Ten largest industrial cities.
2/ Twenty-five typical medium-sized industrial cities.
3/ All other libraries working with unions.

Only in what can be called the miscellaneous group was there a sizeable number of programs initiated at union request. Examination of the questionnaires reveals that many of the most successful programs were developed as a result of library initiative. Only eight of the 156 librarians reported that they had tried to arouse union interest and failed. In two cases (Brooklyn, N.Y., and a St. Paul reference library) other librarians in the same community had success.

It is evident from discussions at Joint Committee meetings, from the guide entitled "Developing Library Service to Labor Groups," and from the Oko-Downey book cited earlier that it requires a good deal of imaginative work by someone--in most cases a librarian--to bring about effective cooperation between libraries and unions. In this respect library programs are not different from other organized educational efforts with workers. As already stated, 22 of the 156 libraries working with unions have a staff member assigned specifically to do this work. One might assume that the other libraries with varied programs also have someone on the staff concerned about unions. One librarian responded to the questionnaire with the statement that she must constantly work at it to make the library-union cooperation successful.

Why should this burden fall to the librarian? In part it is because the library as a community institution has the responsibility of ensuring that its resources are adequate to the needs of the total community and that the community uses them. In part it is because the librarian is the professional dealing with a lay population generally unfamiliar with the use of what appears to be a specialized resource. The librarian therefore is responsible for understanding the needs of the group and for demonstrating which of these needs the library can meet and how it can be used to meet them.

Unless the library itself undertakes this task, very little is done. As the results of the Joint Committee survey show, this is the case in most communities. Of the 156 libraries reporting that they did have contact with unions, the initiative for the cooperation came from the union in only 45 instances. An additional 150 librarians who reported unions in their geographic area said there was no contact between library and unions. From their willingness to complete and return the questionnaire (in contrast to so many who did not) one can assume that these 150 librarians would have responded to union requests for cooperation.

It is interesting to note that of the librarians reporting that they did have contact with unions 46 admitted they were not familiar with the work of the Joint Committee and another four did not answer the question at all. Yet, knowledge of the Committee's work is not necessarily followed by contact with unions: 48 librarians who did know of the Committee reported unions in their geographical area with whom they had no contact.

American unions have not developed broad-scale education that involves workers in the learning process so deeply that use of a library becomes automatic and natural. In general, the schools attended by the unionists in their youth failed to develop a concern for continuing self-education in which libraries would have a role. Given the present situation, should not the library be responsible for doing something about this? The ALA's establishment of the Joint Committee on Library Service to Labor would indicate that the profession accepts that responsibility. The comparatively few libraries that do work with unions indicate that as individuals most librarians do not.

At the same time it should be noted that while unionists have welcomed the services provided by an imaginative librarian they have often failed to protect the service when the librarian responsible for it left the particular library. This has been the case in a number of major cities.

Universities Without Labor Education Centers

The National University Extension Association cooperated with us in our effort to determine how much labor education was being conducted by universities and colleges without formally established labor education centers. At our request the NUEA sent out a postcard query to all of its members except those with formal programs. A return postcard was attached on which could be indicated whether educational activity was carried on with unions and, if the answer was "yes," the name of the person most familiar with the details.

There were 30 responses indicating educational activity with unions. Three of these came from universities cooperating with labor education centers in their states: Oakland and Western Michigan universities with Michigan State University; and Northern Michigan University with the University of Michigan-Wayne State Institute.

Follow-up letters were sent to the remaining 27 asking for details of their current or recent activity. Twenty responded. Of those not responding to the follow-up letter, one (Purdue) is known to have worked with unions for many years so we have included that information with the responses received.

Seven of the responses to the follow-up letter indicated no labor education activity as we have defined the term. The other letters, and the known information about Purdue, provided information about 14 universities without labor education centers that do work with unions in this field. Evidence from union sources indicates that the survey based on replies to the NUEA query is incomplete. Eight additional state universities were used by unions in 1965 or 1966 for one-week schools. Unions also reported using the facilities of five private colleges or universities for one-week schools during the same period. In the latter instances the union took complete responsibility for the educational aspect of the program, with the college or university providing physical facilities or meals.

It is likely that the response to the NUEA survey supplemented by the information from union sources does provide a fairly complete account of university work with unions, in addition to the formal labor education centers. We have attempted to provide a general description of this activity below, combining the information gained through the NUEA with that obtained from unions. Since the private institutions performed no educational function we have not included their activities in the description.

The amount of activities varies greatly among the 22 institutions for which we have information. In every case but one, however, it involved hosting one-week regional schools or shorter conferences for national unions or similar activities for state AFL-CIO central bodies. In some cases the institution assisted in the planning, and in most instances university faculty participated in the instruction. The exception to this general observation is the Oregon State System of Higher Education, which reports an effort to establish a more traditional labor education program in the Division of Continuing Education. A retired officer of the Oregon AFL-CIO was employed for this purpose. The program operated during the 1966-67 academic year, concentrating on the training of teachers of stewards, with some other activities. After the year's experiment the program was discontinued. The reason given was that the unions were not interested.

We have attempted to divide the other institutions into three categories, based on the amount and kind of activity.

There were eight universities that worked mainly with a single-union organization over a fairly long period for a single annual program or, in a few cases, a group of programs. The Steelworkers have met at the University of Kansas for 21 years, and the UAW at Purdue for about as long. Purdue also trains apprentice instructors for the Plumbers and Pipefitters in conjunction with the national apprentice contest, but this fits the category of skill training rather than labor education. The other universities that are working consistently with a single national union are Rhode Island with the Rubber Workers, Ohio University at Athens with the UAW, and Alabama with the Communications Workers. For a number of years the University of Kentucky has hosted the Kentucky AFL-CIO one-week school; and the University of Nebraska, the state conference there. The Texas AFL-CIO and the University of Texas cooperate in a number of schools, usually held off campus. In 1966 there were four.

Seven universities have recently had programs with a single union group: Colorado State, Tennessee, and Georgia with the Communications Workers; Bowling Green State University, Ohio, with the Rubber Workers; the University of Virginia with the Steelworkers; Mississippi State with one of the postal unions; and the University of Arkansas with the school sponsored by the Arkansas and Oklahoma state AFL-CIO organizations.

Six universities have worked with a variety of unions over the years. The most active of these is the University of Oklahoma, where the Machinists, the Communications Workers, the UAW, and the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers have met regularly, and which has been used for the joint Arkansas-Oklahoma school mentioned above. While there is no formal labor education center at the university, there is an interest in working with unions in both the academic faculty and the continuing education department. This attracts unions, as does the new continuing education center. The Machinists and the Communications Workers use the University of Oregon, which also hosted a state AFL-CIO school when one was held. Kent State, in Ohio, regularly hosts a UAW school, has worked with the Steelworkers, and recently sponsored a conference with the State AFL-CIO. Another Ohio state university, Miami, has worked with the International Union of Electrical Workers for a number of years and has hosted other unions, most recently the Steelworkers. Both the University of Washington and Washington State University have held schools for a number of unions, the unions sometimes shifting between the two institutions.

In understanding this record of cooperation it is important to keep in mind that, aside from the Oregon experiment, resident education is involved, usually for one week. The initiative in locating resident schools rests with the unions: in a national union, usually with the education staff; in a state AFL-CIO, with the officers. Most of these, but not all, seek a university atmosphere because of the prestige, because the facilities are usually good, or because they may need educational assistance. Most of the institutions that reported are in areas where there are no university labor education centers. In such instances it is natural that the unionists should seek help from state universities, and in most cases there is sufficient interest in the university, either in the academic faculty or in the extension division, to establish cooperative relations. If the experience is not satisfactory the union tries another institution another year, until it is satisfied it has the best arrangement possible.

In some states, however, the unions have seemed to make a conscious effort to avoid the university that does have a labor education center. Often these are unions that feel completely competent in the educational aspects of the school and are looking only for physical facilities. Some unions have had an unsatisfactory experience with the labor education center relating to cost, physical facilities, or program--or a combination of these. Sometimes the reason is tradition: the union started to work with a university some time ago and, since the experience was successful, does not want to change.

For those states without labor education centers there is a question that arises: Why is it that a state university which has worked with a union or a group of unions over the years has not established a formal program that will extend beyond the campus and employ labor education experts? Experience in the field would indicate that this is due to lack of effective demand for such a program from the unions, particularly the state AFL-CIO. Competition for the university dollar is now so great that administrators are not seeking new ways to spend money, certainly not in extension, which--aside from agriculture--in most states is expected to pay for itself. Formal labor education programs already exist in those states in which the university sees labor education as an important part of a total program. Unless the state labor movement regards this service as important and exerts the kind of pressures to which universities and legislatures respond, it is unlikely that the university will invest the time and money required to establish a meaningful education program with unions. In many of the states unions are not strong enough politically to exert the pressures needed. In others, they are not sufficiently interested in education.

Local Public Adult Education

In the chapter on university labor education centers we noted that one school district, Philadelphia, conducts a broad program of labor education, and that the local adult and vocational schools in Wisconsin cooperate with the university labor education center in sponsoring such activity and bear the major portion of the cost of the courses in the communities. The UAW reported cooperation with school districts in Michigan in the development and promotion of adult elementary and high school courses in union halls.

We sought to find out how much school districts and unions cooperate in adult education other than in vocational education. We were interested both in programs such as Philadelphia's or the union's involvement in the more traditional adult programs as in Michigan. In a state survey it was making, the National Association for Public School Adult Education helped us by adding a question on this subject. The question asked state directors to identify communities where such programs might be in effect. Most states replied that they knew of no such activities, but a few states identified some communities.

We followed up by writing to the director of adult education in a sample of the communities named, excluding any whose activities we already knew. Our letter explained the purpose of our survey, indicated the kind of information we sought, and asked for details about specific activity, including the union group involved. We received almost no replies. Those who did reply indicated that they had cooperated with unions in vocational education. Because of the nature of the responses we felt it was not worthwhile to continue our search for information from the other communities named in the NAPSAE survey.

There was one further effort to obtain information. The principal investigator spoke at a general meeting of the NAPSAE national conference in November 1967. There he mentioned our interest in examples of cooperation between public school adult educators and unions. While a number of adult educators talked with him at the end of the meeting they did not add to the information already available. It is therefore safe to say that aside from vocational education the instances of cooperation are isolated. Nevertheless, it is useful to describe the existing few instances and draw some general conclusions.

The chapter on university labor education centers includes a description of the Philadelphia school district program, showing that in general the nonvocational activities follow the pattern of university centers. Some, however, do not fit that pattern. There are courses in union halls that prepare students for the high school equivalency examination; some unions have sponsored nonvocational courses in dressmaking and millinery; there are some dance classes. Philadelphia reaches out to the unions with a wide variety of adult education, conducted for individual unions in their own halls.

There are other examples of support for traditional labor education through adult education in Pennsylvania. The labor education center at Penn State has trained unionists as teachers of stewards, preparing them to conduct courses under the auspices of the local school district. As would be expected, Philadelphia uses such instructors. There have been courses for stewards in the Reading and Williamsport areas. In some cases adult education funds pay the teachers; in others, vocational education funds are used.

The project initiated by the UAW in Michigan is quite different. It focuses on elementary and high school courses for adults. The union promotes classes which are held in union halls by the adult education divisions of a number of school districts in the metropolitan Detroit area and in Flint and Lansing. In Lansing the local central labor union is the sponsor. In the first year of this activity, 1966-67, the UAW estimates that about 3,000 unionists registered for the courses, and about two-thirds of them finished. Two-thirds of the registrations were for high school subjects and one-third for elementary. The director of Detroit public school adult education credits the publicity about the union classes for increasing enrollments in the evening schools and the adult day school.

Key to the Michigan program is the willingness of the schools to set up classes for unionists in union halls. Most labor educators feel that it is easier to recruit for classes in union halls than in the schools, and that the unionists feel more at ease with others like themselves than in the mixture attending general adult classes. There are some examples, however, of high school adult courses for unionists conducted in the schools. New York City is cooperating in such a program with a local of the Service Employees.

The Labor Education Center at Rutgers has served as a vehicle for bringing unionists seeking educational advancement into contact with the adult schools and with the high school equivalency examinations. These efforts have taken place in several communities and the Rutgers center is attempting to spread the idea. The high school diploma, obtained either through courses or special examination, has a vocational importance, in part, since it is a requirement for job advancement in many business firms.

These few illustrations indicate possibilities. They demonstrate that unionists can be involved in adult education if the public program is flexible enough to permit courses for special groups in convenient and attractive locations. Courses for adult workers may also require a flexibility in teaching method. This was easier to manage in Michigan than it would be elsewhere because of the UAW involvement in education, with a staff that could work at the problem. In most communities the initiative must come from the adult educators, who are professionals and who should be interested in spreading educational opportunity.

In different ways Penn State and Rutgers are showing how a university labor education center can help develop a relationship between public adult educators and unions. The centers can also teach public adult educators to work with unionists.

It is unlikely that many school districts will develop a broad labor education program like the one in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia activity has a long tradition of support from the unions. With the present financial pressures, few school districts will consider embarking on a new venture of this type. But they should at least want to bring unionists into the adult programs for which they are already responsible.

Community Colleges

In the fall of 1968 some trade unionists in Michigan will enroll in their community colleges for an associate degree in labor studies. This will be a new project developed by a group of Michigan community colleges at the request of and in cooperation with the UAW. The program is open to all who wish to take the courses but the UAW is making a special effort to enroll its own members. The labor studies major will offer academic courses which deal with various aspects of trade unionism. The other courses will complete the requirements for an associate degree. The project is intended as an opportunity for individual educational advancement and as a preparation for students who will assume more responsible roles in the union. 12/

The Michigan development is the most striking example of union cooperation in labor education with the community colleges. We were interested in community colleges for a number of reasons. They are a rapidly growing branch of higher education, generally following a policy of open admission and directed toward a low-income student body including adults. Most of the community colleges conduct noncredit adult education, and many of them work with unions in vocational training.

We sought information about community college activities with unions during our interviews with labor educators. Fortunately, the Center for Labor Research and Education at the University of California at Berkeley was conducting a study of the community colleges in that state in the spring of 1968, and made available to us a summary of the returns. 13/ We felt that the experience in California might indicate the trends in the rest of the country. California community colleges are well established; the state has a large union movement, and many of the unions cooperate with the community colleges in vocational training, particularly in the related training of apprentices.

Our findings from these sources are illustrative. They indicate that thus far very few community colleges are working with unions in programs other than vocational education.

In addition to the Michigan experiment already described, the labor education center at the University of Iowa is cooperating with some community colleges in that state in its long-term, noncredit courses for unionists. There is also interest in courses for unionists in some community colleges in New York and New Jersey, but this interest has not yet produced any operating, concrete programs. The labor education centers in those states are being consulted by the community colleges.

The Berkeley survey did not uncover any major activity. The questionnaire was sent to 80 community colleges. There were 76 responses. Sixteen indicated that they had conducted programs in cooperation with unions in subjects other than vocational training. Of the 16, 7 listed courses in the general area of labor education, industrial relations being the only course listed more than once. The responses indicated that these were occasional courses, not part of a continuing program.

The Berkeley questionnaire also sought information on the extent to which apprentice-related training had been integrated into associate degree programs. Twenty-seven colleges indicated that they do provide such integration on an individual basis, but there was not sufficient information to ascertain the extent. There were no responses that indicated clearly that an associate degree program had been worked out with a specific union, although there had been public reports of such cooperation with some unions.

If the California experience is at all typical, it seems clear that thus far very few unions are turning to community colleges for education other than vocational training. Nor are community colleges reaching out to the unions. The integration of apprentice instruction into associate degree programs appears to be one way of providing for educational advancement, and closer cooperative effort between the unions and the colleges than is indicated in the survey might make these programs more meaningful and obtain greater participation.

The development of a specific curriculum in labor studies, as in Michigan, is also a way of making the associate degree more meaningful for trade unionists. Some university labor educators were concerned that the traditional academic approaches to content organization and teaching might discourage blue-collar unionists. They suggested that the problem approach and the development of interdisciplinary courses would be more suitable for educating blue-collar workers and that these changes could be made without reducing academic quality. Such a shift would require care in developing the curriculum and selecting the teachers. 14/

A few university labor educators see the network of community colleges in their states as a base for elementary trade union education, with the university center playing a coordinating role. As yet, however, no one has worked out such a structure.

Vocational Education

For many years some labor educators have felt that federal and state vocational education funds could be an additional source of support for labor education. So far as federal reimbursement to the states is involved, there is the requirement that the money be spent to provide or improve job skills: that is, that the program be directed toward the vocational aspect of the worker's interests. Within this framework many state and local programs for the related training of apprentices have included sections on industrial relations and collective bargaining, with attention to the role of unions. In this study we have not been interested in that aspect of vocational training but rather in the use of vocational funds directly in labor education. 15/

In his survey in 1955 Joseph Mire 16/ reported that three states--Alabama, Florida, and Wisconsin--were using vocational education funds to provide what might be regarded as continuing labor education while in four other states there were occasional services.

We attempted to check on the present situation by sending a questionnaire to all state directors of vocational education asking what programs existed, how they were financed, and the name of the person in charge. We indicated that we were not interested in those programs that were a part of job training such as the related training of apprentices. There were 37 responses to the 51 questionnaires sent to the directors of vocational education in each state and the District of Columbia. While eight directors reported cooperation with unions in labor education, follow-up letters indicated that in five of these instances the work was high school vocational education or the information concerned unions in apprentice-related training. The three states reporting support for labor education were Alabama, Florida, and Pennsylvania. Wisconsin did not respond to our questionnaire, but it does continue the program described by Mire.

Iowa did not respond either, but the University of Iowa Center for Labor and Management, which conducts labor education programs as part of its function, does receive $10,000 annually from vocational education funds, 17/ although it is not clear that this money is used for labor education. Labor education practitioners do not know of any vocationally supported programs in other states that did not respond to the questionnaire. It can be assumed, therefore, that there are four or possibly five states in which vocational education funds are being used to support labor education as we use the term in this survey.

The situation in Wisconsin is unique because that state has a system of local vocational and adult schools that are separately administered and financed and that receive state aid. Under the system, the University of Wisconsin School for Workers is paid by the local school for conducting courses for unionists in their home communities. Most of the money is raised locally, the state providing a small, varying share. No federal funds are involved. Because these are vocational and adult schools, the method of financing the School for Workers' courses might more easily be described as support by state and local public adult education rather than by vocational education.

In Alabama there is a specific labor education program, begun in 1947, operating under the assistant state supervisor of Trade and Industrial Education with a full-time staff person. Support comes from both state and federal vocational education funds. A description of the program is included in the chapter on universities.

The Florida Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education employs a coordinator of employee education who works with unions in the state in planning educational activity, including the state AFL-CIO one-week school, and participates in conferences and other activities. The person involved, a former unionist, is closely connected with the state labor movement. The program does not itself sponsor classes or conferences. Federal funds are involved in the support of this program.

In Pennsylvania a vocational education grant made it possible for the Pennsylvania State University Department of Labor Education to conduct an experiment in the training of teachers of stewards. This program is described in detail in the section on teacher training in this report. It was hoped that the teachers so trained would be employed by local adult or vocational education authorities to conduct stewards' classes as part of their on-going activity. To some extent this has taken place in the labor education program of the Philadelphia Board of Education; elsewhere in the state, to a lesser extent. Two such grants were made, mainly from federal funds. This project was job-oriented since it prepared teachers for employment.

The foregoing isolated instances of support for labor education from vocational education funds provide no pattern except to indicate that great flexibility is possible in state programs. With the present pressures on vocational education for job training as part of an over-all manpower program, it seems unlikely that there will be any effort to develop other directly employed staff for labor education, as in Alabama and to some extent in Florida. Yet, as university labor education centers carry on staff training, they are unquestionably in a field that would be eligible for federal reimbursement, just as supervisory training is now reimbursable. Since vocational education is organized through state programs, support for staff training would have to come through the state vocational education authorities, each with its own set of priorities and pressures and its own interpretation of eligibility for support under state and federal law.

The indications are that university labor education centers seeking vocational education funds for all or some of their programs would need to explore the possibilities within the state, as did Penn State in connection with its teacher training.

Cooperative Extension

In some areas representatives of the Cooperative Extension Service are working with unions, particularly in programs relating to consumer and homemaking problems. To find out the extent of this activity a letter was directed to the 50 state directors of the Service requesting information on any such programs that had been conducted or that were being planned. Those responding included a majority but not all of the industrialized states. Thirty-one replies were received. Of these, 23 indicated that they were conducting no programs with unions; two others recruited through unions for general community programs. In two states the Service reported occasional speakers or consumer classes in response to union requests. In one state, West Virginia, a program of consumer education is being developed cooperatively with the Institute for Labor Studies.

Three states, Hawaii, Illinois, and Ohio, reported regular activities directed specifically toward unionists. In the sugar and pineapple plantation sections of Hawaii a large number of the local University Extension Clubs are made up of the families of members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. These clubs carry on the traditional programs, including all homemaking skills. At the request of the union similar activities have been started with union members employed in canneries. There have been special sessions for union groups in planning for retirement, family investment, securities, and wills. Unionists have also participated heavily in consumer workshops and medical self-help programs directed to the general public.

In Illinois and Ohio the cooperative extension services have worked with AFL-CIO community services representatives in providing courses and conferences on consumer problems or for the consumer sections of more general community services conferences. In Illinois this activity has been in Cook County while in Ohio it has been statewide. Unionists involved in the Ohio programs report that representatives of the service have responded willingly to requests for help but that the staff varied in its ability to communicate with workers and their families.

The project being developed in West Virginia will consist of a consumer course particularly for active women unionists. It will be sponsored through the local central labor bodies as a joint venture of the

Institute for Labor Studies and cooperative extension. Both of these are located in the university's Appalachian Center. A course outline and materials are now being prepared.

There are two natural avenues for the involvement of cooperative extension in labor education. One is the community services consumer programs. The other is the university labor education program, particularly in those states where both cooperative extension and labor education are based on the same campus, in a few instances in the same extension division.

In our report on community services education we note that there is some but not widespread consumer programming. Material from the national AFL-CIO Department of Community Services lists cooperative extension as a resource for this activity, and there is probably more widespread use of this resource than indicated in the reports from the state directors of cooperative extension. What is significant in these reports is that the service itself does not seem to be generally aware of this opportunity.

This seems equally true with respect to labor extension activities. An effort is being made in West Virginia, as indicated earlier. No reply was received from Michigan cooperative extension. However, the Michigan State University Labor Program Service uses home extension staff in its consumer programs, and for one period some years ago it had an extension agent assigned to its staff to work with unions. There were some efforts at cooperation at the University of Missouri prior to the temporary halt in the labor education program there when the staff left for other positions. Just recently a cooperative extension agent has been assigned to work with the labor education program at Rutgers on an experimental basis.

The experience in these cases is inadequate to indicate whether the lack of cooperation is a missed opportunity. In Hawaii the experience is so specialized that it does not appear to be generally applicable, although it may indicate possible areas of cooperation for the new unions of farm workers on the mainland. It may be that trade unionists do not have sufficient interest in consumer problems, the natural area for working with the cooperative extension service. Some reports indicate that some retraining is required for the extension agents to be effective with union members. There has not been sufficient effort at cooperation to know whether it can be successful.

U.S. Government Agencies

A number of U.S. government agencies work with unions, conducting educational activity for unionists or providing resources for labor education. This section of the report will describe the labor education activity of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Division of Labor Standards of the Department of Labor, the Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports of the Department of Labor, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board.

Other agencies of the federal government have made grants for labor education. These include the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Office of Education and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The projects financed by these agencies are described in the section on community services education in Chapter IV and the section on special projects in Chapter V.

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

Section 203 of the Labor-Management Disputes Act of 1947 established the duty of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to engage in preventive action for the purpose of minimizing labor-management disputes. As a result, the Service has developed a program called preventive mediation. The training of shop stewards and foremen is one aspect of the program, which also includes the development of joint labor-management committees, consultation, continuing liaison, and other activities intended to provide more constructive labor-management relations. 18/ These activities are referred to as preventive mediation "cases."

Preventive mediation has received increasing emphasis by the Service and increasing acceptance from unions and employers. Correspondingly, the number of cases has grown steadily. Cases involving training have shared in this growth. The attention to training stems from an awareness that much of the irritation in industrial relations arises between the foremen and the shop stewards. The Service feels that a training program focusing on the practical aspects of grievance handling improves the over-all relationship between unions and management.

The original training programs were generally one or two sessions based on specially prepared audio-visual aids which presented a shop problem for group discussion. The decision whether to hold separate or joint sessions for the foremen and the stewards would depend on the company involved.

Experience indicated that short sessions did not provide the training in depth necessary for lasting benefit. As a result, a more sophisticated approach was developed, broadening the areas covered and encouraging the conduct of what could be called a course. However, there is no fixed pattern. While most of the training cases do involve a series of sessions, there are still some one- or two-session programs, on the assumption that the mediators will do the best they can to develop what training is possible.

At present a typical training case consists of six one-and-a-half to two-hour sessions covering communications, leadership, responsible grievance handling, and human relations. Audio-visual aids continue to be a major part of the sessions. The Service has developed a number of short film strips and motion pictures suitable to various aspects of the program. In addition, in cooperation with Oregon State University, it has produced a series of films on the negotiation process, stressing mediation. Films generally available in labor education, such as those produced by the National Film Board of Canada, are also used.

The classes are conducted by mediators. They are discussion sessions based on situations presented chiefly by audio-visual aids and hand-outs. Most of the sessions use audio-visual materials (in the 1967 fiscal year there were 1,340 audio-visual showings at 1,210 training sessions). Some of the mediators have had previous teaching experience; others come by it naturally, while still others learn by working with those who have had previous experience in the program. Many of the skills that contribute to the success of a mediator are those required for a good teacher of adults. They include the ability to listen; to encourage others to talk and define issues; to clarify controversy and help others do the same; and to develop the group's confidence in the mediator as a person. Not all mediators are equally good teachers or equally interested in training, but the number involved in training programs has increased. The Service is now preparing a preventive mediation manual which will include training ideas, materials, and other aids that are available from the regional or national offices.

It is impossible to get an exact account of unionists trained by the Mediation Service in any given year. Attendance figures are available only from the individual case records and often only on a session-by-session basis. This much is known: In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, there were 322 cases involving training (in fiscal 1966 there had been 117). The 1967 cases involved 1,210 sessions, distributed as follows: 557 were for stewards only; 395 were for foremen only; 192 were combined; and 66 were "other." This last category included public sessions, programs in cooperation with universities, and similar appearances.

It is estimated that the average session is attended by 15 to 25, although an examination of a sample of case records indicates that attendance at single-session programs is much larger. Since the Service has no records indicating how many of the sessions were part of continuing classes, and the attendance figures are at best a guess, it is impossible to arrive at a meaningful total. But even assuming that only half of the training cases were continuing classes and the average attendance of those completing the course was 20, it is clear that the Mediation Service is training a sizeable number of union stewards, using well-prepared audio-visual aids and instructors with considerable experience in labor-management relations. The training includes much that is part of the traditional union stewards' class, omitting the sections that deal with union policy and the skills of building the union. There is an emphasis on labor peace.

In general, the mediators avoid competition with steward-training programs conducted by unions or universities; they tend to work instead with the unions that lack an active education department and in geographic areas inaccessible to the traditional programs.

An examination of a sample of training cases showed considerable variety in the programs that had been developed. The reports indicated that the training had grown out of the union-management relationship and was aimed at the solution of an on-going problem. In the Philadelphia area there were also several instances in which the mediator was called in for a single session of a steward-training class conducted by the Philadelphia Board of Education or Penn State. Mediators teach in a number of Catholic labor education centers.

Bureau of Labor Standards

The promotion of industrial safety is a major function of the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U.S. Department of Labor. As a part of this work the Bureau has a continuing program that trains unionists to develop and conduct safety training. There is a staff for this program, and numerous training aids have been developed. 19/

Safety training is provided in cooperation with national unions and their locals and with AFL-CIO state and local central bodies and building trades councils. A training course includes 30 class hours, some of which is devoted to instructor training. During 1965 and 1966 the Bureau conducted 42 such courses for 20 different union groups, with an enrollment of 2,263. Various unions were involved, representing the construction trades, the maritime industry, and mass-production workers as well as six AFL-CIO state central bodies.

The Bureau also conducts shorter safety training sessions which encourage unions to establish their own safety training. During the same two-year period 24 such sessions were held, with an attendance of 3,128. A large number of these were held jointly with the Operating Engineers, as part of the safety program of that union.

The Bureau staff keeps in close contact with union safety training programs, providing materials, consultative advice, and assistance.

Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act requires regular financial reports from unions and sets standards of union conduct in certain areas. The is administered by the Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports of the U.S. Department of Labor. The Office conducts a technical assistance program to help unions understand the requirements of the law. 20/

During the early period of the law a good deal of the technical assistance took the form of conferences for unionists. The conferences were called clinics; they paid particular attention to the requirements on financial reporting and were attended largely by local union financial officers. The clinics were held in cooperation with national unions and central bodies. As the unions have become more familiar with the procedures the number of clinics has declined sharply. During the 1963 fiscal year, for example, 689 were held with an attendance of 18,835. In fiscal 1965, the last year for which a separate figure is given, there were 100 clinics attended by 2,500. The earlier clinics usually lasted a half day or occasionally a whole day, but those held now are shorter. While the emphasis on financial reporting remains, there is some attention to election procedures.

In addition to the training conducted at clinics, the technical assistance staff also appears at union conventions and meetings of local central bodies and may teach in university-sponsored union educational programs, usually for a single session on the law.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has the responsibility for administering Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, relating to discrimination in employment. Since the law affects unions and some traditional union practices, EEOC has felt it important that union leaders have an understanding of the provisions of the law and its administration. 21/

The main effort to accomplish this has been a series of regional conferences held in cooperation with the AFL-CIO Department of Civil Rights. The EEOC labor liaison staff, the EEOC regional offices, and the AFL-CIO jointly plan and conduct the conferences. Speakers come from the unions and the EEOC. Between April 1967 and May 1968, five such conferences were held: in Cleveland, Washington, Atlanta, Albuquerque, and New Orleans. Attention is given primarily to the law and the operations of EEOC, but there is also stress on the development of what are called affirmative programs, to open employment opportunities to minorities. There have also been some conferences with individual unions.

Since there is a large number of state commissions on equal employment, we wondered whether any of these were conducting education programs for unionists. At our request the most recent reports of the state commissions were checked by the EEOC liaison office for any evidence of such activity. Very little work with unions was reported.

National Labor Relations Board

Understanding the operations and rulings of the National Labor Relations Board is important to full-time union staff, particularly organizing staff. Much of the teaching about this aspect of labor law is done by attorneys who represent unions, but there has also been considerable involvement of NLRB staff in conferences and courses that have been conducted by unions themselves or in cooperation with universities; and NLRB representatives have often addressed labor-management conferences on labor law that were sponsored by industrial relations centers, bar associations, and other groups. 22/

A survey made in early 1967 indicated that most of the NLRB regions have been involved in such activities, with a fairly large number of presentations at conferences of full-time union staff. In a few instances NLRB representatives have taught in courses sponsored by universities or Catholic labor education centers. In most cases the initiative for NLRB participation comes from the sponsoring group, the union or the university. The content will vary in accordance with the desires of the group.

There was more initiative from the NLRB itself in a series of conferences which marked the 25-millionth vote cast in an NLRB election. The occasion was nationally noted by the Board, and several regions joined with labor, management, and other groups for educational sessions dealing with new developments in labor law. These were generally community conferences which drew unionists as part of the total group.

As this summary shows, the NLRB has been urging greater education in labor relations law, and has been making its staff available as a resource for this purpose. However, it has not developed its own program for such education, as has the Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Civil Rights Organizations

We have already noted that the labor education programs of both the unions and the universities are paying increasing attention to the problems of minorities in the United States. This is illustrated by the special programs on minority problems and by the inclusion of civil rights issues in the more traditional labor education.

In this section we are interested in education directed toward unionists that is conducted by organizations whose primary concern is civil rights. 23/ Two kinds of education are conducted by such groups. Some is for all union activists, to acquaint them with civil rights problems. Some is for minority group union members, to help them function more effectively in their unions and in their communities. Attention will be given first to education for all unionists, and then to the special programs for minorities.

Southern Regional Council

The Southern Regional Council is a long-established research, education, and action organization focusing attention on the problems of the south. For many years the Council's staff has been a resource for union education in the area, teaching courses or delivering lectures at schools and conferences run by national unions and state central bodies. During the period of our survey the Council expanded its work with unions by employing a labor education specialist who was on leave from the University of Wisconsin School for Workers and who had previous experience in labor education in the south.

The Labor Program, which is now concluded, increased the Southern Regional Council's involvement in existing union education, promoted some activity that would otherwise not have been conducted, drew trade unionists into broader Council conferences, developed some special materials for workers, and distributed Council literature to unionists. The general purpose of the Labor Program was to develop among unionists an understanding of the changing south, including race relations and civil rights. Sometimes this was done in direct discussion of these issues; sometimes as an appropriate part of other subjects.

The Labor Program participated in 19 educational activities involving about 1,000 unionists. Eight of these programs were sponsored by national unions, including one week-long school. Seven were programs with state central bodies (two one-week schools, four conferences, and one program at a state convention). One was the four-week southern staff school sponsored by the National Institute of Labor Education and the AFL-CIO Department of Education. The other three were more general Council conferences in which unionists participated along with others.

Among the special materials developed were some concerning the federal wage and hour law because coverage was expanded and the minimum raised during the period of the project. The more general materials dealt with minority problems, the southern economy, legal rights, and voting.

Other Programs

Three other civil rights organizations do some education work with unionists. For many years the 10-person field staff of the Jewish Labor Committee has worked with AFL-CIO state and local central bodies on civil rights issues. These activities usually include annual conferences on minority problems, sponsored by the central body with much of the staff work performed by the Jewish Labor Committee representative. Civil rights issues are also discussed at a national conference of the Jewish Labor Committee that is attended by a large number of trade unionists.

Some unionists have participated in regional conferences held by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. These conferences have the dual purpose of informing unionists about minority employment problems and acquainting NAACP members with union practices and structure.

The conferences run by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission were described earlier in this chapter in the section on U.S. government agencies.

Education for Minority Unionists

Labor education primarily for unionists from minority groups is a more recent development and is quite limited. Only one organization, the Urban League, has defined this as a focus for one of its programs. The League's Labor Education and Advancement Program (LEAP) has as one of its objectives the training of non-white trade unionists in organizational skills and knowledge necessary for leadership. The major thrust of the project, however, is to open job opportunities for non-whites, so there have been only a few courses with the union objective.

One of the courses, in Philadelphia, was directed almost entirely to training minority unionists for more effective union activity. This course, sponsored by the Philadelphia Urban League and conducted by the Philadelphia school district's labor education program, drew students from a number of unions.

Other LEAP courses have been given in St. Louis and Milwaukee, but they have differed from the Philadelphia course by focusing partially on general problems of minorities and drawing some white unionists as students. The St. Louis courses were run in cooperation with individual unions, ACWA, IUE, and AFSCME. One of the three courses in Milwaukee was sponsored by the Steelworkers; in the second, the Steelworkers joined a directly affiliated AFL-CIO local; while the third was run for the Milwaukee County AFL-CIO Council. The University of Wisconsin School for Workers cooperated in two of these courses.

There is one other example of special classes to prepare minority unionists for leadership. The Trade Union Leadership Council in Detroit, as part of a broader educational program, conducted a series of eight-session courses which provided training in speech, parliamentary law, and communications for about 120 unionists. These covered a two-year period.

The Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality conducts intensive training of Negro community leaders, particularly in the south. Some unionists who are community leaders have participated in these programs, and there has been some attention to the problems of working with unions. But there has been no special effort such as that of LEAP and the Trade Union Leadership Council.

If there should be an expansion of labor education directed to minority unionists, it will follow the approach used many years ago in the training of women unionists. The Women's Trade Union League, the summer schools for women workers, and the industrial department of the Young Women's Christian Association all conducted educational programs solely for women. The rationale for the separation was that women could be drawn more easily into such activities and that separate group education could be more effective for those whose self-confidence is undermined by a minority relationship that makes them feel powerless.

Some Other Organizations

A few other organizations have a primary purpose other than labor education but give special attention to the education of unionists or did so during the period of this survey. One of these, the International Labor Press Association, might have been included in the section on union education since it is the organization concerned with the publications of AFL-CIO affiliates. The others are the American Arbitration Association, the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty, and the Foreign Policy Association. 24/ There are some other organizations that occasionally conduct educational activity with unionists but so infrequently that they are being omitted.

International Labor Press Association

The International Labor Press Association is made up of the publications of AFL-CIO affiliated national unions, state and local central bodies, and local unions. One goal of ILPA is to improve the quality of the labor press. The annual conferences, therefore, have an educational function and character. This is accomplished by combining high-level training in editorial skills with sessions on problems of communication and social issues. The skill training usually takes place in workshops.

ILPA educational activity is brought closer to the grass roots by four regional labor press associations and an association of Steelworkers' local publications. These hold regular conferences which mix skill training with a discussion of union problems. A special effort is made to bring the editors of local union publications to the regional meetings. Three of the groups, those in New Jersey, the midwest, and California, conduct their activities in cooperation with university labor education centers. The fourth, based in New York City, does not.

American Arbitration Association

An important part of the work of the American Arbitration Association provides machinery for grievance arbitration arising from labor-management contracts. The Association is concerned that unionists understand the role of grievance arbitration, that they are familiar with arbitration procedures, and that they are skilled in preparing and presenting arbitration cases. Therefore it has prepared materials on arbitration, has provided staff for labor education activities, and has sponsored some educational programs, usually in cooperation with industrial relations centers or similar groups.

The materials are of three kinds. There are general descriptive pamphlets explaining the rationale for grievance arbitration and describing its effective use; films of arbitration hearings, useful as a basis for discussion; and cases that are used for mock arbitration as a training device. Unions and university centers make use of these materials, both for steward and staff training.

Association staff are available for presentations about arbitration or participation in mock hearings. The presentations are usually single sessions at a school, a conference, or a staff meeting. On occasion an Association representative will teach a one-week course at a union school.

Most of the educational programs directly sponsored by the Association are open to management and unionists.

Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty

As a part of its training efforts with poverty groups the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty has established a residential training center in Delano, California, to work with the farm workers in the area, members of the Agricultural Workers' Organizing Committee. The training center began operation in 1967, after the period covered by this survey, but it is noted because of the character of its work.

The major activity has been to provide six months of residential training to groups of 20 unionists. Two six-month sessions were held in 1967. The course combines background information and skill training. In addition to emphasis on such traditional union subjects as organizing, bargaining, union administration, and legislation, the center also prepares unionists for work in various institutions that have been developed to meet the special needs of the workers and their families. These include hiring-halls, credit unions, health services, and some cooperative enterprises. The six-month term is now the longest period of residential training conducted for any group of unionists in the United States. The center is also undertaking part-time training of union stewards and officers.

Foreign Policy Association

For a brief period the Foreign Policy Association made a special effort to assist unions in education about international affairs. One

FPA regional director, having previous experience as a labor educator, devoted some time to this work. There were two special projects: one with the UAW, and the other with the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs.

The UAW project included the development of discussion materials for the 1964 one-week schools and an evaluation of these materials and their use in the schools. The project also led to a survey of the attitudes of UAW members, officers, and staff regarding issues on international affairs.

FPA assisted the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs in conducting two weekend conferences in early 1965, one in Austin, Texas on Latin America; the other in San Francisco on the Far East. The person responsible for this work has left the FPA staff.

Footnotes

1/ Material for this section was collected by mail and by telephone interview. Requests for information were sent to officials of a list of programs suggested by The Right Reverend George G. Higgins of the U.S.Catholic Conference. Telephone conversations were held with the directors or the acting heads of the ten programs that were identified and they were asked to suggest additional programs. Reverend Higgins was interviewed personally.

2/ School of Industrial Relations, The Labor Guild, Archdiocese of Boston, Boston, Mass.; Institute of Industrial Relations, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; Institute of Industrial Relations, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.; St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations, Jersey City, N.J.; Institute of Social Education, St. John College, Cleveland, Ohio; Xavier Institute of Industrial Relations, New York, N.Y.; The Labor Management Center, The Institute of Human Relations, Loyola University, New Orleans, La.; Labor Management College, Diocese of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.; Labor Management School, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Cal.; and St. John Vianney Labor School, Catholic Labor Institute, Los Angeles, Cal.

3/ Rev. Leo C. Brown, S.J., "Catholic Sponsored Labor-Management Education," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 20 (April 1947), p. 512.

4/ Caroline F. Ware, Labor Education in Universities (New York, American Labor Education Service, 1946), p. 16.

5/ Benjamin L. Masse, "Social Actionists Convene in Cleveland," America, Vol. 93, No. 26 (September 24, 1955), pp. 616-18.

6/ Gilbert Cohen, "Library Service to Labor: Historical Roots and Current Needs," reprinted in Dorothy K. Oko and Bernard F. Downey, Library Service to Labor (New York, Scarecrow Press, 1963) pp. 52-56.

Chapter VI Footnotes (cont'd)

7/ Oko and Downey, op. cit., preface.

8/ Developing Library Service to Labor Groups (Chicago, American Library Association, 1967), p. 1.

9/ Ibid., pp. 1, 2.

10/ This comment is based on discussions with librarian members of the Joint Committee and with other librarians who have developed programs with unions.

11/ Joseph Mire, Labor Education (Madison, Wisconsin, Inter-University Labor Education Committee, 1956), p. 158.

12/ Workers' "Opportunity" College, Publication No. 407 (Detroit, UAW Education Department), no date.

13/ "Summary of Junior College Questionnaire on Education Programs Sponsored in Conjunction with Labor Unions" (Center for Labor Research and Education, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley), typed, no date.

14/ Hy Kornbluh, "The Blue-Collar Family, The Public Community College, and Labor Education" (Ann Arbor, Michigan), unpublished paper, no date.

15/ A statement by the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education, issued on June 16, 1964, in response to a request from the United Steelworkers of America, contains the following section which relates to the use of federal vocational funds for training of unionists:

> "Classes for Specific Purposes
>
> Federal funds may be used to support vocational training for union officials, stewards, and committeemen, and management officials and supervisors on the following conditions:
>
> "1. The training program is not directed primarily toward the furtherance of specific union objectives, management activities, or benefits which are unrelated to more efficient production or improved job environment.
>
> "2. The educational programs designed to meet the needs of these individuals can be specifically related to increased safety and efficiency on the part of the individual worker and in the performance of the activities for which he is being trained and compensated for by an employer.

Chapter VI Footnotes (cont'd)

15/ (continued)

> "3. Only those individuals engaged in union steward or management supervisory activities or those who may be expected to engage in such or similar activities within a reasonable period of time after the conclusion of such training may be enrolled."

16/ Mire, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-99.

17/ Reported to the University Labor Education Association in a survey of the financing of university labor education, 1966.

18/ Information on the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service was obtained from reports of the Service, through interviews with the staff of the Deputy Director in charge of preventive mediation, and by an examination of case records.

19/ Information on the Bureau of Labor Standards was obtained from correspondence and reports, including a special report on safety training prepared for the survey.

20/ Information on the Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports was obtained from annual reports of the Office and an interview with the staff.

21/ Information on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was obtained from interviews with the staff.

22/ Information on the National Labor Relations Board was obtained from a special report prepared by the Secretary of the NLRB and from an interview with him.

23/ Information on the activities of civil rights organizations was obtained from interviews with the staff of the AFL-CIO Department of Civil Rights and through correspondence with the organizations, not all of whom replied to our letters. The Southern Regional Council provided a report of the activities of the Labor Program; and the Urban League provided reports of its classes for unionists. Some of the staff of the Urban League project were interviewed.

24/ Information for this section was obtained from correspondence, from interviews, and from reports when they were available.

CHAPTER VII

SOME SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF LABOR EDUCATION

Course Content

Throughout the report course content has been noted in conjunction with various types of labor education. At the risk of duplication this section will attempt to summarize the general trends.

Most labor education is still directed to improving union skills and the understanding of unionism and union problems, whether the program is designed for local activists or for full-time staff. Within this framework, however, certain changes are taking place.

Courses are being developed for two groups of unionists who were not previously involved to any extent in labor education: government employees and construction workers. More has been done for the first group than for the second, but unions and universities are now conducting courses designed for construction unionists.

The second important change in course content is an increase in the sophistication of training for union skills. Greater emphasis on educating union staff has made it necessary to develop courses in special aspects of bargaining and organizing and in problems of union administration, which differ from those for local union officers. Staff education also invites the use of more sophisticated teaching methods; in a few instances some of the findings of the behavioral sciences are being applied.

The education of local unionists is also affected by these trends but not universally. Union administration is probably changing most, with greater attention to communication skills, decision making, and group process as contrasted with the simpler courses in speech and rules of meetings that were common in the past. There is also an increase in industrial engineering courses for local unionists.

When they are taught as part of long-term programs, such traditional courses as collective bargaining and union administration have greater depth. In that context such courses place more emphasis on understanding and regard the learning of skills as a by-product; this is the reverse of earlier practice.

Increased union attention to politics and legislation has broadened the concept of what social problems should be brought to the classroom. Community services education has been conducted for some time. So has education about such laws as workmen's and unemployment compensation and the laws which control industrial relations. Today we could add to these such current legislative goals of labor as consumer problems, reapportionment, taxation, and the general problems of education.

A greater change has come about as a result of the general recognition that union concerns include poverty and the position of minorities in society. There has been an increase in education directed toward understanding these issues and training unionists to do something about them, both within the union and in the larger community. There are short courses, conferences, and special projects which concentrate on one or another of these problems. They receive greater attention in one-week schools. Urban affairs is the most recent major social problem to receive special attention.

Some labor educators sense a reluctance among unionists to deal with controversial questions like civil rights and international affairs. Examples in both areas were cited. Even so, there has been a sharp increase in programs concerned with the problems of minorities, either directly or by including them in a broader framework such as poverty, unemployment, or urban affairs. However, international affairs is one content area that appears to be receiving less attention than it did in the past. There were never many programs concentrating solely on international affairs, but the American Labor Education Service did conduct some. With few exceptions, at present international affairs education seems to be confined to single sessions at union schools and conferences, or more rarely one-day conferences.

A major change in labor education in the last ten years has been the increase in the number of courses without union training as a direct objective. The primary subject matter is the social sciences, which make up the bulk of the university long-term programs. Most of these courses seek to help unionists understand the society in which they live. When offered in sequence, as in many of the long-term programs, they provide an opportunity for a rounded education. There are also individual courses with a general-education objective, particularly among those which bring together students from several unions. In a few communities and in a few unions, these courses have gone beyond the social sciences to the humanities and the arts. It seems clear that such educational programs will form an increasing part of labor education. In part it is this interest in general education that is responsible for the attention that is being given to credit courses and labor studies degrees.

There is another aspect of labor education which is also just beginning to emerge that is related to individual educational achievement. That is the involvement of unionists in programs leading to a high school diploma, either through regular adult courses or through preparation for the high school equivalency test. We cannot tell from the sporadic efforts thus far whether this will become a general practice.

Materials

Throughout this report the point has been made that labor education is institutionalized in specific unions or in specific university centers and that one result of this characteristic has been a fragmentation of the field. This becomes particularly clear when one examines the materials that are used as course outlines for the teachers, as student readings, or for classroom use by students.

Examining course titles, one finds a consistent emphasis in all programs on certain areas like steward training, collective bargaining, union administration, communication skills, and labor political activity. Similarly, most of the university long-term programs have courses in the standard social science disciplines: economics, political science, sociology, and sometimes history and psychology.

Yet there are very few standard materials that incorporate the best experiences so that they can be generally available. There are a few exceptions. The specialization of training in industrial engineering and the leadership offered by the Wisconsin School for Workers and the AFL-CIO Department of Research have been responsible for teaching materials in this field that are in general use. When the Federal Executive Order on collective bargaining for federal employees was issued, the AFL-CIO Department of Education prepared background material on the executive order and on federal employee unionism which was used widely by the unions concerned and university centers. The cooperative effort of Rutgers, Penn State, and West Virginia in the Union Leadership Academy has resulted in a set of materials for the courses taught in that program. And the one-week school manual prepared each year by the AFL-CIO Department of Education is in wide use, particularly for those schools sponsored by AFL-CIO state central bodies.

In general, however, each institution, whether union or university, prepares its own materials for its own programs. This is especially true for the national unions like UAW and CWA, which place major emphasis on fairly permanent materials, but also for unions with lesser activity which prepare materials as they need them. There is much borrowing of ideas and even some parts of a course, but each union feels that the materials have to be peculiar to its own needs to be of greatest value.

The same argument is made by many instructors against the development of standard university short-course materials. For education to be most effective, it is said, the short course should be tailored to the needs of the group being served, and the content and approaches planned with the group. The best of the short courses do follow this pattern, but there are many that do not, and there are certain common elements in each subject-matter area. In most universities instructors have what might be called a "bank" of materials from which they draw for individual programs.

There are other factors that hinder the development of standardized materials. In a comparatively small field like labor education, there are many individualists, each of whom has his own teaching style and desires materials to fit that style. The limitations of the field and its specialized character have made the preparation of materials unattractive commercially.

Certain subjects in labor education deal with current problems, and for these the materials must be constantly updated and cannot be prepared for long-time use. But there are other areas where this is not the case. It is in the latter group of subjects, now being taught quite generally in labor education, that gaps in teaching material can be easily identified. There is no good outline or text on economics for workers, or for that matter none in politics, American history, sociology, or psychology. There is no good book for unionists on collective bargaining, either the theory or the practice, nor any on the structure and practice of unionism. Some labor histories are usable, but none has been specially written for union classes. There are many current social problems on which background material would have some permanence, even though the current emphasis might change. These include civil rights, urban reconstruction, taxation, housing, and education. A longer list of subject-matter areas for various kinds of programs could be developed but these examples illustrate a need that is recognized by most labor educators.

Recently the University center in Hawaii has attempted to fill part of the gap with a series of course outlines which have been widely distributed, but it is too soon to know whether labor educators will start to use these.

The establishment of the NILE materials center should bring together those materials that have been developed by the various institutions in labor education so that they can be more readily available to practitioners. Here, too, however, it is too early to know whether the center will be useful and used.

With this introduction, we will examine the character of the materials now in use: those for teachers, then those for students, and finally special fields like films, correspondence courses, and experimental materials.

Materials for Teachers

Teaching materials are prepared with various types of teachers in mind. They may be full-time labor educators, university professors or others teaching part time in labor education, or regular union staff teaching occasionally.

In the basic skill subjects--those dealing with stewards' responsibilities, union administration, bargaining--some unions and universities have prepared teaching outlines which organize the content in useful form. These outlines are a resource built up over the years in which these subjects have been widely taught, and experienced labor educators are aware of them. They include a large number of cases, discussion quizzes, role-playing situations, and other devices to involve the student in the learning process.

In the more advanced functional subjects such as organizing and bargaining, outlines and course materials are less available except in very specialized areas such as industrial engineering.

There is little course or background material for those programs dealing with current social issues. Most instructors rely on their own wide reading of labor literature and general publications. Some help is provided by the articles on current economic issues prepared by the AFL-CIO Department of Research, published in the AFL-CIO Federationist.

For part-time teachers, particularly union staff, a number of unions prepare special teaching outlines. These usually contain substantive information with a plan for organizing the sessions and suggested teaching techniques. In many cases the outline for the teacher is keyed to sets of materials for students that he is expected to use. This is the method followed by both the UAW and the CWA in their teaching materials for one-week schools and for classes that union staff teach throughout the year. By providing standardized materials they guide the staff into teaching fairly uniformly throughout the union. Other unions, like the IAM, URW, and OCAW, have also prepared teaching outlines for staff on basic subjects such as union structure or steward training, but these are generally designed to be used in locally initiated programs and to be adapted as the individual sees fit in the situation. Those unions like AFSCME which train local union instructors have very detailed materials to guide them (see section on teacher training later in this chapter).

Some universities also prepare teaching aids for part-time teachers. These may take the form (as in a recent brief outline on politics from Indiana) of a suggested way of organizing content so it will be meaningful to labor students; or, as in several recent Cornell handbooks, the materials may be focused on techniques, cases, and questionnaires that will encourage the teacher to forego lectures and use student involvement techniques in his classes.

Materials for Student and Classroom Use

Materials given to students in labor education vary according to the program. In long-term programs, staff programs, and some others, the students are often expected to read and prepare for class; in most other programs, little homework is required and the written materials they receive are for classroom use or for a reference back home.

In the long-term programs, students are expected to read, either paperback books or specially prepared materials. The special materials may be collections of readings or an exposition of the subject intended to be simple and to meet workers' interests. Sets of readings have also been compiled from time to time for other programs such as the West Virginia short courses on state and local government and the poverty-training programs in Appalachia and New England.

The materials most commonly given students in short courses, conferences, and one-week schools are brief, one- or two-page sheets on various subjects, put together in a notebook. These are amplified by class discussion. Notebooks or manuals for one-week schools are the longest type, containing information on a variety of subjects. Notebook materials draw on a range of sources (newspaper clippings, legislative testimony, research articles, government publications) and the best of them translate this into short, lively expositions of current union interests. Such notebooks may be composed by unions or universities for programs they are running. For the teacher, the notebooks provide material to be used in class and often give the latest information as well. For students they are auxiliary reading and a reference source.

Films

Films are used in labor education to set the stage for discussion. They are invaluable in dealing with current social and political issues because they arouse student interest and involvement in these subjects in a way that few other methods do.

Unfortunately, as in written materials, few commercial or television films are suitable for labor groups, and unions and universities have little money to make their own. However, enough films have been brought together from union and outside sources to make them a feature of many types of labor programs.

Nine unions reported that they make films from time to time. The AFL-CIO also makes some films, usually on political issues, and occasionally a state central body produces a film. Most of these union films are not produced for labor education; they have a public relations function with the membership or the public. Those that have relevance, however, are widely used in education. The only unions which have recently made films specifically for education are the CWA, which produced an organizing film for its growth schools, and the UAW, which regularly makes or edits films to fit into its teaching outlines.

Like union education departments, university labor education centers have limited funds, but a few of them have made films aimed at specific needs in labor education.

Thus many of the films used in labor education are produced by outside groups. The outstanding producer in this category is the National Film Board of Canada, which many years ago made a number of films on unionism, primarily for educational use. Several of these films have become classics in labor education and are used over and over. In recent years the Film Board reduced the number of new films directed to a labor audience, although some are still being made. The American Arbitration Association has produced several films on grievance arbitration which are in general use. A few of the films made by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are now being used.

Non-labor groups are the main source of films dealing with current social issues. Some of these are made by churches, government departments, or groups concerned with minority problems. But the greatest source of films on social problems has been the television documentary which is made available for educational use. The identification of films from outside sources that are useful in labor education is a service performed largely by the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

The film library run by the department is the largest single source of films for labor education. The UAW also has a major film library, and a number of national unions, state central bodies, and university centers have smaller libraries, mostly of films in common use.

While rentals from the AFL-CIO Film Library give some idea of film use in labor education, it should be kept in mind that these other film sources exist and are maintained by those institutions which make the greatest use of films as a teaching tool. In 1966 the AFL-CIO library held 265 titles. For 124 of the most commonly used, the department had prepared discussion guides indicating how the film could be used most effectively and sometimes providing supplementary background information. Labor education was only one purpose of the rentals, the others being union meetings and public school classes. A conservative estimate indicates that 20 bookings a month were for labor education activities.

There are a few labor education programs that rely heavily on the use of films. Roosevelt uses both documentary and feature films in its long-term program as the basis for discussion of a variety of subjects. The UAW uses films, sometimes made for the purpose, as the basis for much of the one-week school content and also builds short-course teaching outlines around them. CWA uses films in its steward training. Films are used regularly in the Meat Cutters' conferences. In several youth schools held by the AFL-CIO during 1968, about 20 percent of the time was devoted to films and their discussion.

Correspondence Courses

There has been relatively little interest in correspondence study in labor education, partly because labor educators are so convinced of the value of group process and group discussion in learning. In the past, several unions have experimented with correspondence courses with varying degrees of success, although they found that the workload of maintaining the courses and correcting the papers was greater than expected.

During the survey period, there have been three correspondence courses in operation for unionists, two of them sponsored by unions and one by the University of Indiana. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen prepared three home-study courses that were offered to the members of both unions. These courses dealt with 1) union structure and functioning (five lessons, \$7.50); 2) collective bargaining in the railroads (ten lessons, \$15); and 3) the union and the community (five lessons, \$7.50). Any member could enroll on payment of the fee, and local lodges could subscribe for groups at somewhat lower cost. We were not able to obtain complete figures on the enrollment in these courses, but the Firemen and Enginemen report that during 1965 and 1966 nearly 3,000 people signed up for the courses, mainly the one on union structure, and about 25 percent of these completed the course.

The UAW has experimented with home-study courses for those attending one-week schools who wished to continue their education. In the late months of 1967, after the year's summer schools, there were 88 members actively enrolled in the program, indicating that the course has a limited appeal.

A quite different kind of course was a 10-session correspondence course in labor journalism offered by the Indiana labor education center. This was directed primarily to the editors of local union publications. When the course was first offered in 1962-63, 35 enrolled and 19 completed it. The course was offered again in 1965, with 115 registrations and, one year later, 32 completions. There were two resident workshops for the first group and one for the second.

Experimental Materials

There has been little experimentation in the form of labor education materials. Programmed materials, for example, require a large investment in preparation which is worthwhile only if the program can be used for a large group or over a long period of time.

The UAW Leadership Studies Center has developed programmed sequences on group insurance, pensions, and social security, which were used quite successfully in staff training. An experimental program has also been developed to explain the concept of the gross national product. Both of these are intended to provide basic understanding prior to class discussion.

Another example of programmed instruction in U.S. labor education is the use by a few unions of a program for training stewards that was developed commercially in Canada with the cooperation of the unions in that country. The program covers some of the standard steward-training substance, and in the United States it has been used as the basis for class discussion as well as individual instruction.

The UAW Leadership Training Center has also developed a different type of experimental material, the simulated union, described in some detail in the section on this center in Appendix II.

CWA has recently prepared materials for use by self-starting study circles which it is encouraging in its locals. A series of four meetings on consumer protection have been set up, each session beginning with a recording that presents some aspect of the subject.

In its application of management training techniques to labor education, Cornell has experimented with various approaches, some of which required the development of new materials. Examples are a series of tapes to teach listening skills, and the adaption of the "in-basket" training method to the problems of union staff.

Evaluation

The formal evaluation of action-oriented adult education is not simple. The test of success in this field is not solely what the student has learned or even what changes have occurred in attitude; rather it is what actions have resulted from the educational experience. Thus the traditional measuring sticks of evaluation do not apply to many important aspects of labor education. For this reason much of the evaluation has been informal, particularly in the more common types of program: short courses, one-week schools, and conferences. When there is concern about the effectiveness of the education, it is assumed that an astute observer can make intelligent judgments on the basis of observation and student reactions, both in and out of class.

This kind of assessment is often supplemented by simple questionnaires seeking information about teaching and the appropriateness of subject matter, filled in by students at the end of a program. Occasionally there will be a more sophisticated form followed by a group evaluation session. Usually these student judgments are made during a period of euphoria which makes everything look quite good, unless it is very bad indeed. As a result, most labor educators look at this type of evaluation very cautiously, because of the conditions under which the judgments are made and because they do not indicate what the students will do as a result of the educational experience.

Some unions use staff analysis following an educational program as a substitute for or supplement to student questionnaires. The ACWA and Meat Cutters are examples. ACWA follows each conference and one-week school with a meeting of the education staff involved and, where possible, staff representatives of the locals and joint boards. There is a student questionnaire at each of the Meat Cutters' conferences and a full report from the person in charge. These are analyzed by the education department for its own use and for the sponsoring local, to assist in future planning.

While course examinations are not common practice in labor education, Iowa and Minnesota are now using them in the long-term programs. In some courses they use the same test as a pre-test and final examination. Penn State followed the same procedure with students at the Steelworkers' one-week schools some years ago. 1/ Those who use these tests of increased knowledge recognize that they do not indicate what the students will do with the new knowledge; nor do they test the increased motivation for union work which may come from an educational experience.

There have been some sophisticated efforts at evaluating labor education. Many of these were part of special projects. Often the financing of the project included a requirement of evaluation and funds for it. But there are some evaluations that dealt with more traditional activity. Brief descriptions of some of both follow. They will not be reports on the results of the evaluation; rather they will indicate what information was sought and the methods used. Those dealing with traditional labor education will be described first.

One of the very few efforts to judge the impact of short courses was conducted with the New York City taxi drivers who attended Cornell classes during the taxi organizing campaign. 2/ Questionnaires were used to find out how the students perceived the impact of participation in labor education, in some cases contrasting these perceptions with those of taxi drivers who did not attend class. Among the issues dealt with were the following: How did the classes affect participation in the campaign, including the reasons for more effective leadership? How did classes affect attitude toward self? Contrast in perceived changes between class participants and non-participants; and contrast in self-esteem between participants and non-participants. A final table distributed the newly elected union officers between those who had gone to class and those who had not. In his summary the investigator was careful to point out that willingness to attend the classes was an indicator of those who would rise in the union, and that the changes took place as a result of intense involvement in an organizing campaign, of which attending class was only one important activity.

Some years ago the Michigan-Wayne State Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations conducted an evaluation of two UAW summer schools. 3/ Identical tests were used at the beginning and the end of the schools to uncover changes in attitude as well as increased knowledge, and to see if these related to such factors as age, years in the union, leadership role, geographical location, and expectation. The questionnaire dealt with student expectations on the newness, helpfulness, and understandability of the material; it tested subject-matter knowledge and student attitudes on readiness to act in support of the union, importance of speaking up in support of the union, confidence in speaking up, perceived ability to influence others, and readiness to act in support of the union. There were also questions on teaching method. This evaluation of the UAW school differs from most examinations of student judgment by its sophistication and the correlations that were possible.

The CWA education department conducted a quite different type of evaluation of its one-week schools for community union builders. 4/ These schools were intended to encourage local union organizing campaigns. First attention was paid to activity that followed the schools: Was there more organizing among the locals that participated in the schools than in those that did not? A second measure of activity contrasted the organizing effort of locals serviced by staff that attended the schools with the effort of those locals serviced by staff that did not attend.

On the basis of a local union questionnaire sent out some time after the schools were held, a contrast was made between the reasons for difficulty in getting organizing started given by the participating and nonparticipating locals. There had been student evaluations at the close of the school. The later questionnaire also sought student reactions on what was learned and what changes should be made in the program. A questionnaire on the total operation of the school and its results was also sent to the union staff who served as instructors.

Most unions that conduct staff training regularly do some kind of student evaluation, often two: one at the close of the session and later by mail. The evaluation conducted by the UAW Leadership Studies Center is an example. 5/ There is a brief questionnaire at the close of the school that covers such items as physical facilities; changed attitudes toward the school; time for assignments; most significant experience; comments on presentation and content of each subject taught; and suggestions for changes, with room for further comments. At one point a more detailed questionnaire was mailed to all past participants. It attempted to find answers to the question, "How has the Leadership Studies Center functioned in the union?" Questions dealt with physical facilities; change in attitude toward the center while there; quality of experience; effect on the job and attitude toward it; and effect on attitude toward UAW. There were several questions on the courses, asking for omissions, judgments on the emphasis given in different subject-matter areas, and information on sessions providing specific help on the job, in the community, and to the student as an individual. The final questions asked for the most significant experience, whether the Center should be continued, and suggestions for staff education in the regions. There was room for further comments.

Increasing university emphasis on long-term programs has focused attention on their meaningfulness and on the problems of maintaining continuing registrations for the entire series of courses. Ohio State has conducted some surveys of the character of the students in the long-term programs and their expectations. 6/ Indiana has surveyed some of its long-term students, identifying their characteristics and seeking information on their attitudes toward the program, including course and instructor ratings and reasons for dropping out. 7/

The most sophisticated study of the impact of a long-term program is now being completed at Penn State, comparing 1967 graduates of its Lehigh Valley Union Leadership Academy courses with a similar group of unionists who did not attend or who dropped out after taking no more than two courses. 8/ This is a three-year study, the final two years of which have been financed by a grant from the Office of Education. The study will contrast the student and non-student groups with reference to changes in behavior and attitudes in a wide variety of areas. It will also seek a method for identifying potential ULA dropouts.

The attitudinal variables being contrasted include the role of the worker in society, self-concept, perceived goals, ability to make independent judgments, and job satisfactions (including union activity as part of the job). The behavioral variables include union participation, participation in political activity, participation in other community activity, vocational adjustment, job changes (including union role), and changes in leisure-time activities.

As would be expected, Penn State has developed sophisticated instruments for this analysis, as well as using some more generally available measures of attitudes and personal preferences.

Aside from the continuing staff-training program at Harvard, long-term resident training of unionists is so rare that evaluation would be expected. This was the case in NILE's project for union staff in 1961 and 1962 and in the more recent Indiana project in cooperation with the Steelworkers. As a part of its grant to NILE for residential staff training the Fund for Adult Education set aside a major sum for evaluation which provided for a separate staff and report. 9/ There was a resident evaluator in each school, using numerous tests, interviews, and conferences that attempted to reach every aspect of the program. Evaluation became such a major part of the schedule that some administrators had the feeling that their schools were being conducted for the benefit of the evaluation rather than vice versa.

Evaluation was also built into the Indiana project but much less obtrusively. During the first year the evaluation was directed by a member of the staff of the Center for Liberal Education for Adults. In the second and third years the university staff carried through the evaluation. The third-year evaluation is used here to illustrate what was done. 10/

The evaluation had the dual purpose of keeping in touch with developments as the program progressed and helping to arrive at final judgments about its success. The administrative staff, faculty, and students were all involved. Faculty and staff reactions were obtained at regular lunch meetings. Each instructor prepared a written report on the class and each student's role in it. There were also some written examinations, essays, and reports on which instructors could base their judgment of students. The administrative assistant observed the classes regularly.

The students were consulted in a variety of ways. There were group evaluation sessions every two weeks. There was a personal interview with each student halfway through the program. In addition, other meetings between the students and the administrative assistant aided the evaluation. Brief reaction sheets were used following each of a series of Sunday night seminars. There were some tests of attitude change. The students rates all courses, instructors, and readings; and each student filled out an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the program.

The final questionnaire asked 24 specific questions about the program, dealing with expectations and how they were fulfilled, with courses, methods, readings, studying, use of leisure time and university resources, and expectations for the future. The final report, therefore, became a combination of judgments based on various sources of information that complemented each other.

The report of the third-year program was prepared too early to include a follow-up on the students when they went back home. There was such a follow-up for students in the first and second years.

Evaluation has been a part of the OEO grants to universities for the training of trade unionists for more effective community action against poverty. As in the longer resident labor education programs, evaluation has a dual function: to help guide the training as it takes place, and to judge the over-all success. Unlike the resident programs, however, the OEO training is directly action-oriented, so what the trainees do is far more significant than what they have learned, how their attitudes have changed, or how they feel about the program. On the other hand, since the training is for an activity that is new to most of the trainees, it is easier to judge the results than when the training is directed toward the improvement of traditional trade union functions. The evaluation of the first year of the Appalachian project is used here as an illustration of what is being done in these projects. 11/

The evaluation was developed with certain conditions in mind: It would be difficult to develop objective measures for many of the factors that determine success; certain before-and-after contrasts could not be made because of the nature of the project; and evaluation should not interfere either with the training or the back-home activities of the trainees. At the same time the close relationship between the trainees and the project staff throughout the entire period made possible a flow of information on which many judgments could be made.

There were six sources of information upon which the evaluation was based: (1) trainees' attitudes and activities developed through questionnaires, interviews, letters, and conversations; (2) staff observations at sessions, in the field, and in personal contact with trainees, CAP officials, and community leaders; (3) a limited survey of the antipoverty activity of AFL-CIO central bodies in Appalachia not involved in the project, to provide a contrast; (4) a survey of CAP directors' opinions on trainee contributions to antipoverty efforts; (5) case studies of individual trainee progress; (6) the involvement of the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council in various other antipoverty efforts following the training.

From these sources of information it was possible to develop measures of trainee success and to make some contrasts which relate to the training, making possible intelligent judgments about the success of the program.

Meaningful formal evaluation of labor education is difficult for the reasons indicated earlier. It is time-consuming and can be expensive. The question arises, therefore, whether the results provide better judgments than those of an astute program administrator who is concerned about success. There is some value in proving that the astute observer can make valid judgments, and this has been the result of many of the before-and-after tests and student evaluations. Student evaluations also help give the students a sense of involvement in the program which is valuable to the learning process, particularly in staff training. But this purpose can be destroyed if the reactions are ignored.

Perhaps the most important reason for engaging in formal evaluation is that it forces program administrators to continually examine their activities, the objectives of the programs, and the methods by which they are conducted. This is needed in all education that is carried on without much change over a long period of time, as is the case with some types of labor education.

Because the quality of activity is the basic test of successful labor education it is not possible to apply the traditional educational measures, and not enough attention has been given to developing new ones. Yet the effort to do so may be a wild goose chase. It will always be difficult to decide whether the unionist-participant in labor education rises in the union because he attends classes or whether he attends classes because he wants greater responsibility in the union. It is probably equally difficult to discover whether the student who functions more effectively after an educational experience does so because he has acquired new knowledge and skills, because he has been more highly motivated, or because he has gained more self-confidence.

There are some simpler issues in which evaluation might help improve quality. Considerable attention is now being placed on long-term programs. Is it possible to judge the success of different teaching methods, or the impact of the kinds of readings used, or the organization of course content? What about size of class in labor education? Classes will range from a dozen to 50. Does it make a difference? Labor educators all assume that it does, but do we know? Any labor educator could add to these examples of areas in which some experiments in evaluation might be worthwhile.

Training Unionists as Instructors

In an effort to increase the teaching resources available to labor education, a number of unions and universities have held instructor-training programs. For the most part the persons trained have been unionists, either staff or local union leaders, and most of the training deals with subject matter familiar to this group: grievance handling, local union administration, and similar union activities.

A number of factors determine the character of a teacher-training program. Who is being trained--staff or local union leaders--and how much do they already know? Should the training increase subject-matter competence as well as develop expertise in teaching techniques? Should the group be given detailed lesson plans to organize the content and lay out techniques, or should they learn to develop their own? What types of materials must be prepared? Lastly, what guidance and support will the instructors receive after the training is ended? Will they fit into an established union or university program, or are they expected to generate activity on their own? In the descriptions that follow, these factors are noted.

Three university centers, Roosevelt, Michigan-Wayne, and Michigan State, have trained unionists in order to increase the number of teachers available to them. Such teachers are paid at regular university rates when used. Three other universities, Penn State, Indiana, and Rutgers, have increased their supply of teachers through training in programs originally designed for somewhat different purposes.

The Michigan-Wayne and Michigan State training program is a joint operation. Local union leaders and some staff are selected for the program, which usually takes two weekends and emphasizes teaching methods, particularly discussion techniques. The group is trained around standard outlines, and the program emphasizes steward training and related fields of local union activity. The Roosevelt program is similar to this.

The Penn State program, which is the most thorough of the current programs, was originally conceived as a way to make steward-training classes easily available throughout the state at low cost to the unions without having to commit major university labor education resources. It trained instructors to be used in classes set up by local school districts. The teacher-training project was financed by a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction with money available under the 1963 Federal Vocational Education Act.

Instructor training was held in six different Pennsylvania cities during 1965-67. The trainees, from a wide variety of unions, were local leaders and a few staff persons. They were selected with some care, and each group went through a four-phase training program. First came 20 hours of steward training, to familiarize them with course content and demonstrate sessions; then 20 hours of methods training. After this, each trainee organized and taught a 16-hour steward's course and, finally, attended an evaluation institute for two days. Of the 139 who originally enrolled in the program, 67 completed it, and the Penn State staff considers at least 80 percent of these competent instructors in the subject.

In three of the Pennsylvania cities where training was given, classes financed by school districts have been held. In Philadelphia, the School District's labor education program used nine of the 15 graduates to teach 23 courses in the first year after their training, and a number of these have continued to teach. School districts in the Reading and Williamsport areas have also sponsored classes. In the other three areas it has not been possible as yet to work out arrangements with the school districts. However, a number of the teachers have taught for Penn State and others have been used by their international unions, so that to date about 30 of the graduates have taught classes.

The Indiana and Rutgers programs were begun at the request of unions. The UAW asked Indiana to train teachers for its classes in newly organized local unions. The Indiana center had long been interested in increasing its own resources for steward training and tried to interest other unions in the training but failed. The training session covered three days, mainly on methods, using UAW and Indiana outlines for practice. Out of this program, Indiana and the UAW are now using eight new teachers. Rutgers held two one-day training sessions for members of an IBEW local in New Jersey, with trainees later teaching courses in the local, and from this the university has developed a new teacher for its own use as well.

A number of unions have also initiated teacher training, many of them aided by universities. Such programs are more than an attempt to increase teaching resources in the union; they are usually aimed also to help institutionalize the training of local union leaders and spread it through the union by providing local resources who will generate local education activity as well as teach.

Since the Meat Cutters rely on local staff instructors (largely business agents) for the one-day institutes which are the heart of the program for local unions, they have a regular series of one-week training programs for this staff, conducted with the help of Roosevelt University. The emphasis is entirely on teaching method. The program relies on the basic subject-matter competence of the staff, which is occasionally a problem because the Meat Cutters' institutes cover a wide range of subject matter. Since 1955, 300 persons have been trained as instructors, and 135 of these are still active.

CWA provides training in teaching methods for all new staff, to backstop its national program which requires regular field staff to teach officers and stewards in the locals they service and to help on other subjects at conferences and summer schools. CWA regularly prepares detailed teaching outlines, with lesson plans, on all major union education programs, so the week for new staff is spent largely on techniques, practice teaching from the outlines, and discussion of the ways in which education can be used to solve local union problems.

Union staff were trained by the AFL-CIO Department of Education and the Government Employees Council in cooperation with the centers at Michigan-Wayne and Michigan State in 1964. This was for unions affected by Executive Order 10988, and it emphasized content and background on the executive order as well as teaching techniques in order to prepare the staff to teach officers and stewards of government employee unions. Materials were specially prepared and the instructors trained were later used in institutes sponsored by the Metal Trades Department as well as in their own union programs.

While the Meat Cutters, CWA, and AFL-CIO were concerned with training staff to teach, several other unions have trained local union leaders for this task. The IAM education department has conducted a number of instructor-training programs for local leadership in the airlines industry. Trainees were selected by their lodges and districts with the understanding that they would set up sessions for stewards when they return. The training sessions were five days, at national headquarters, and provided a mixture of content background (on the industry, legislation, and similar subjects the trainees do not know in detail), teaching techniques, and practice teaching on a detailed session-by-session outline particularly prepared for the industry. The union has also held several follow-up sessions for trainees in which they are encouraged to work out their own sessions and given additional content background. The results of this training vary, depending in part on the individuals and in part on the extent to which various lodges are willing to use the instructors.

AFSCME has made the training of local unionists as steward instructors a major part of its national union education program, and now has regional education staff who administer the program throughout the country and train instructors. This national staff was trained by the Cornell center in a method known as "line by line" training which was pioneered by the Pulp and Sulphite Workers' education department some years ago. The AFSCME staff, having undergone thorough training at Cornell, now uses the same materials and techniques to train local instructors who then teach stewards.

"Line by line" training is being used not only by AFSCME but by several other union groups in New York State who have been trained by Cornell. It is designed for the local union lay instructor who teaches in a situation in which he already knows the people, the agreement, and the union. It relies on detailed materials, for the teacher and the students, through which they proceed step by step in each session. Materials, are meticulously prepared for each union group, and are designed to generate discussion through questions, questionnaires, and large amounts of specialized case materials, some of which are used in role playing. Procedurally, nothing is left to the judgment of the teacher, but the answers to the questions and cases are expected to come from the group in the light of their own best thinking during the discussion.

Behind this lies the thinking that the novice instructor needs to rely on a rigid procedure. Moreover, he is not expected to be an expert or authority on subject matter beyond his own knowledge of the union: his skill lies in leading discussions and using the materials properly. The materials are so designed that they will not lead him into subjects that cannot be answered out of his own knowledge or from the group, so long as he follows them. Thus the question of subject-matter competence, often a problem for novice instructors both in their own minds and in that of the students, is by-passed.

However, this type of teacher training is not regarded enthusiastically by all labor educators, particularly those who feel that the teacher has a creative role in a class beyond the set materials and content.

The Cornell center has trained local instructors in a number of locals and regional groups in the state to use this method. In each case, materials were specifically prepared for the union and the group. During instructor training, the material is covered slowly with demonstrations by the faculty of each new set of exercises and each new method. Trainees then do their practice teaching on the materials. Once the training is completed, the university usually sends an observer to visit the classes set up by the instructor and to discuss teaching problems with him; in the national AFSCME program this is done by regional field staff of the union.

The AFSCME program has not been in full operation long enough to let us judge the results. In the other unions where Cornell has trained by this method it seems to work when there is a built-in union education structure or staff to give the instructor support.

Other unions and universities have also done teacher training from time to time. The UAW trained persons for their new local union program, using their own resources in Michigan and universities elsewhere. The IUE has held sessions with groups of locals in several areas, mainly on methods, so they could conduct or improve their steward training. The University of California at Berkeley held a one-week session with IBEW staff to train them to use an IBEW-prepared outline, and Rutgers has trained a group from the state nurses' association. Colorado trained a group of local unionists to teach in their locals but reports little resultant activity.

Looking at the results of this training over-all, comments from those interviewed indicate that where the selection of trainees is reasonably careful more than half of those trained turn out to be competent instructors, at least in the subjects for which they were prepared. Some unionists have difficulty adapting to the discussion method, and skill in leading discussions takes additional time to acquire. Several trainees in every group were cited as outstanding, with an ability to innovate. Most of those doing the training feel that proper materials are important, both for the initial training and for new subjects which the instructors are later asked to teach.

Comments also noted that where the trainees are expected to set up classes or education programs themselves, they need back-up. This is particularly true in the case of local union lay instructors, since staff instructors usually have the prestige to persuade locals to set up classes. Back-up can come from the fact that there is an established and expected education program in the union or from regular union staff who will support the instructor's efforts.

An interesting sidelight on the whole process of teacher training is that it seems to give confidence and prove excellent training for union leaders in general, since a number of the local unionists who are trained as instructors join union staffs or move up in the union shortly thereafter.

Developing New Labor Educators

An examination of the sections of the report dealing with union and university labor education staff indicates that there is now no formal channel for the training of new labor educators. Local union education experience does help prepare the staff of those unions like the UAW, which draw from their own ranks. The graduate assistants and work-study students in the university labor education centers also get an experience that is helpful in preparing them for labor education, if they are interested; and some part-time teachers are drawn into full-time labor education. All of this, however, is not too different from the learning on the job which is the fate of most of those who have entered the field in recent years.

This was not always the case. Training for labor education was regarded as one of the functions of the long-term resident labor schools that operated in the 1920's and 1930's. The WPA had special training programs. The training given the Young Women's Christian Association industrial secretaries qualified them for educational work with unionists. Later there were special resident workers' education training programs at the Hudson Shore Labor School, transferred to Rutgers when Hudson Shore closed, and at the Wisconsin School for Workers. Cornell ran resident programs in discussion leadership. The year-long ILGWU Training Institute included education as part of its program.

At present a few institutions have undertaken some training on an individual basis, through internships. Rutgers was the first to do this, providing a one-year experience when funds permitted. The Rutgers interns have been unionists who demonstrated an interest in education. More recently, Michigan State established an intern program similar in purpose and length to that at Rutgers. At both Rutgers and Michigan State the interns work with the regular staff in program development and teaching.

Since 1965, Workers' Education Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers has run an annual eight-week summer internship, open to unionists and others. The intern learns labor education methods and programming through visits to various on-going activities and through consultation with labor educators.

There is a somewhat different type of intern program at UCLA, not limited to labor education. UCLA offers a year's opportunity for study to a unionist who is expected to return to the labor movement. The intern helps out in center activities, but he is expected to develop his own interests, which may not be in labor education.

Beyond these internships the community action training projects such as those at Rutgers, West Virginia, and Massachusetts also provide training which is useful in labor education.

The lack of existing programs for what might be called induction training of labor educators has been a matter of concern for some time. Both union and university educators have discussed the problem, and one session of the joint meeting in 1966 dealt with it. A paper presented then 12/ predicted a continuing expansion in the number of job opportunities, outlined the qualifications for a professional labor educator, and made some suggestions for the development of formal systems of training. No concrete action followed the session. The development of new staff, however, is one of the areas in which cooperation between the University Labor Education Association and the AFL-CIO Department of Education has been discussed.

Organizations of Labor Educators

There is no single organization of labor educators that serves as a vehicle for the discussion of problems of professional concern. There are three formal organizations and one informal grouping, each of which has somewhat different functions related to professional needs. None of these includes all labor educators. The informal grouping consists of education staffs of national unions and central bodies affiliated with the AFL-CIO and is coordinated by the AFL-CIO Department of Education. The formal organizations are Workers' Education Local 189, American Federation of Teachers; the University Labor Education Association; and the Labor Education Section of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

Two of these groups have clearly defined constituencies: the AFL-CIO educators and the University Labor Education Association. The other two include members from unions and universities. The closest cooperation exists between the AFL-CIO group and the university association, which jointly sponsor the annual conference that brings together the largest number of labor educators. Brief descriptions of the structure and activities of each group follow, after which are given a few general comments.

AFL-CIO Education Directors

Most of the relations between the AFL-CIO Department of Education and the union educators concern specific educational projects. However, the meetings held by the department to deal with problems of union education are a general professional activity. Until the recent expulsion of the UAW from the AFL-CIO, these meetings included all unions with major education programs.

There are two kinds of meetings. The first is an annual session for all union education staff. As indicated earlier, this is held in conjunction with the meeting of the University Labor Education Association. The effort is to obtain representation from all AFL-CIO national unions and state central bodies interested in education, including headquarters and field and local staff. The union sessions at the conference deal with priority issues in labor education; in recent years education about political issues has been emphasized. Sometimes there are special sessions on the education programs of central bodies.

The second set of meetings brings together the directors of major national union programs quarterly for a discussion of common problems. The agenda includes topics suggested by the education directors as well as those proposed by the department. Specific aspects of union education like staff training or the education of young union members are considered. Sessions are informal, with wide-ranging discussion.

The University Labor Education Association

The University Labor Education Association was formed in 1961 to bring together the staffs of university labor education centers for exchange of information and ideas and discussion of mutual problems. Membership in the ULEA is institutional; participation in its activities is open to all staff of the centers that belong.

ULEA's most visible activity is the annual meeting where, as has been noted, some sessions are held jointly with AFL-CIO education directors. The annual meeting is the occasion for discussion of the particular problems of university labor educators, and for meetings and reports of ULEA committees. There is now a variety of ULEA committees, many dealing with special subject matter in labor education but others directed to such problems as salaries, financing, and staff recruitment. ULEA is also concerned about the extension of labor education to new institutions and new kinds of programs. At present there is an emphasis on increasing committee activity, to focus attention on problems and to obtain greater cooperation among the centers.

In addition to the annual meeting there are occasional meetings of the eastern affiliates. ULEA also circulates reports of special programs of the individual centers.

Local 189

The oldest and most inclusive organization of labor educators is Workers' Education Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers. This is a national local union which serves some of the functions of a professional organization. Currently the local has a membership of 320 throughout the United States, but not all labor educators are members. The membership includes full-time university and union labor educators, part-time instructors, and other individuals interested in labor education though mainly engaged in other activities.

The local was founded in 1922 at Brookwood to serve as a representative of the faculty. At Brookwood it sponsored an annual conference on labor education. The local became national as labor educators away from Brookwood joined. When Brookwood closed, this national character remained and Local 189 annual meetings were held in conjunction with the annual conference of the American Labor Education Service since this was one of the few occasions when those interested in labor education came together, particularly prior to the merger of AFL and CIO. In the 1950's this limited pattern of activities began to broaden. The local took more initiative in planning the annual conference. Funds were raised through dues increases, providing more money for activities.

In this period Local 189 began to intervene to protect its members who were discharged. Its chief approach to problems of wages and working conditions in the field was through wage and salary surveys and the publication of a set of standards for employment. Such surveys are still one of its activities.

In 1961 the local set up its first, and so far its only, bargaining unit as the result of a request from the educators and other professionals on the staff of the IUE. However, the question of bargaining for labor educators has never been fully resolved by the local's membership. Some do not consider it feasible with their employers; others do not see bargaining as Local 189's forte, because they belong to other unions or independent union staff associations which bargain for them. As a result of these attitudes the local's future activities in this regard are hard to predict.

In recent years the Local 189 annual meeting has been held in conjunction with the joint conference of AFL-CIO education directors and the University Labor Education Association. At present the local provides two channels for labor educators to meet and discuss professional problems. There are area chapters in five cities that hold regular meetings on matters of professional concern and work with the labor movement in their area. In addition, the local has recently begun to hold a second yearly meeting, in this case a two-day conference which combines union business with a program on current professional developments of interest.

Since 1959, the local has published "Labor Education Viewpoints," a duplicated journal, which, although published sporadically, offers the only publication devoted solely to labor education. The "189 Newsletter" supplements "Viewpoints" by providing information on current pamphlets and information sources in addition to news of the membership and the local's concerns.

The Labor Education Section of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

Labor educators who belong to the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. designate the Labor Education Section as their area of interest. There are between 150 and 200 members.

In theory the Section should form a link between labor educators and the general adult education movement, but this has not been the case. Many labor educators have not joined the AEA, and most of those who have joined have not been active. This applies particularly to union educators, although a few of these are active in state and local adult education associations. As a result the primary function of the Section has been to conduct meetings at the annual AEA conferences. These meetings have had the dual purpose of informing adult educators about labor education and discussing labor education problems. Those in attendance usually include a number of unionists from the host community who are interested in labor education but are not directly engaged in the field.

From the foregoing descriptions it is clear that the fragmentation that is typical of labor education generally extends to the organizations of labor educators. Local 189 has the largest membership and publishes the only journal, but it has not drawn together labor educators so as to produce professional cross fertilization. It may be that a union of labor educators cannot do this if it takes its unionism seriously.

There has been increasing formal cooperation between the AFL-CIO Department of Education and the ULEA in recent years, going beyond the annual meeting. ULEA has suggested to AFL-CIO that joint committees of university and union educators be established to deal with certain common problems or program areas, and this proposal is in the process of being implemented. However, both the union and university educators have strong institutional orientation that will need to be submerged somewhat if the committees are to be effective. And there are labor educators outside the unions and universities whose viewpoints would not be included in such an arrangement.

The fragmentation of labor education organizations has its greatest impact on labor education itself. But one result has been a general isolation of most labor educators from the organizations in adult education. This is more true now than it was some years ago when several of the independent labor education institutions were close to the general adult educators. None of the present organizations of labor educators has paid much attention to this situation, and the few attempts to bridge the gap have met with general indifference.

Problems of Labor Educators

What do labor educators see as the major problems that face them in their efforts to do an effective job and to expand labor education in the United States?

Nearly everyone interviewed said that, in general, union leadership in the national unions and the state federations does not understand or support education. Exceptions in both groups were cited but it was made clear that they did not change the situation for the entire field.

The point was not always made the same way. Most stated it directly. Others put it in terms of the status of union educators. A few talked about the failure of labor education to involve union decision makers. Most educators felt that lack of understanding leads to lack of support; but some questioned whether there was not an actual fear of education among union leaders. An education director of a major union claimed that most union leaders fear challenges. He said that they are already facing the challenge of change in the composition of union membership and they fear that education will add to their problems. He felt that overcoming this fear is essential to developing real support for union education. A few union educators said that at the present time there is less support than there was 15 years ago, but most did not accept this judgment and pointed to the expansion in the number of union education programs.

Some said that union education directors themselves were partially responsible for this lack of support, citing three factors: an inability to interpret education to union leadership; an inability to integrate education into the total union activity; and the acceptance of an inferior status in the union. None saw an immediate solution, although spokesmen from universities as well as unions thought that greater leadership in education from the AFL-CIO, which they now see as a possibility, might provide a boost in status that would change the picture. Related to this was the feeling by one union education director that the decentralization of labor education, every union and every university going its own way, was a major source of weakness.

The effect of weak leadership and lack of support is seen primarily in the size and status of union education. But some educators state it is also evident in the kinds of programs supported by union leaders, claiming that programs that provide a good show are those which get support. Others said that much union education is restricted to areas that do not make an impact on the union. None said that the restrictions in union education are total but rather that they affect parts of it. Again, it should be noted that individual unions were exempted from this criticism.

Many university labor educators complain about their own status in the university. A number made the point that unless universities revise their attitude toward extension labor education will suffer from lack of support. This factor has prompted some centers to seek an academic base in the university, but those who feel that labor education must remain primarily an extension activity do not agree that the academic base will solve the problem. On the contrary, some charge that one of the problems of university labor education is that it is becoming too academic and losing touch with the majority of its potential clientele.

While university educators are concerned about lack of union support, some also complain that their close ties with the unions make labor education too conformist to union official attitudes and prevent them from exploring social problems that are not of prime concern to the union or from treating controversial subjects like civil rights. One raised the question whether broad education was possible in a union movement he regarded as narrow. Others from universities said that once a labor education center had established confidence in its work among unionists it was possible to win acceptance of broad and controversial programs.

A few other comments were made which are worth noting, even though each reflects the attitude of a minority. Some labor educators feel that there is not enough attention to quality in both union and university programs. Others feel that greater progress could be made if there were better integration of university programs with those of specific unions, a point somewhat different from that made earlier about the need for integration of the entire field. While only a few specifically mentioned the need for recruiting from minority groups for labor education staff, this issue has been a subject of discussion at meetings of labor educators.

New Problems for Labor Education

Labor educators feel that two groups of problems require much more attention than they are now receiving. The first group includes the social and political issues confronting the American people, a large part of whom are trade unionists. The second concerns problems facing unions as institutions. All the people we interviewed mentioned some aspects in both areas; and while there was difference in emphasis there was none in general attitude and no division along union and university lines. We shall attempt in this section to summarize the perspective presented, starting with the social problems since most placed primary emphasis on them.

There was general consensus that trade unionists need to know more about the complex issues of civil rights, poverty, and urban affairs. While there are some trade unionists among the working poor, who have barely achieved financial stability, most unionists do not have direct contact with these problems. The problems are complex and their solution requires changes in established practices; and understanding is essential to intelligent action. Much more education about the problems is needed, including training in effective action programs.

This need applies to both local unionists and full-time union staff. Unless union staff understand the problems of society, one union educator pointed out, the unions lose their character as a movement and function only as a narrow force, each within its own industry. Understanding is necessary if unions are to play a role in the nation's efforts to solve social problems.

There was no implication that this general area is completely ignored in labor education but rather that much more should be done and in more depth. The complex problems of race, poverty, and urban affairs were the ones most stressed, but issues like full employment were also mentioned. A number of educators pointed to the general ignorance among unionists about international affairs as one special area that needs attention. The suggestions for education that relates to unions as an institution were much more varied, some concerning groups within the unions, some dealing with content, and one applying to labor education itself.

There was general stress on the development of special educational efforts to reach young union members. The number of young unionists is growing rapidly, and most have joined already established unions. On the basis of their own limited experience, labor educators regard the young unionist as loyal to the union but viewing it primarily as a source of economic benefits and a protector of working conditions. Young members know little about how a union functions; yet they face the prospect of becoming part of an organization with established rules and leadership. Few young unionists are old enough to remember the conditions under which their parents worked; they themselves have rarely experienced periods of unemployment. These conclusions about the attitudes and experience of young unionists seem justified by surveys made at the experimental schools for young workers conducted by the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

In a sense it can be said that these young workers are victims of two educational failures: the failure of the schools to deal with social problems generally and with unionism specifically; and the failure of the unions to operate an over-all system of education to which interested new unionists would naturally be drawn.

The educational task here is seen as twofold: to provide some understanding of how unions operate and why they function as they do; and to relate workers' problems to the total problems of society. Concern about young members is now widespread. As we indicated earlier, some young workers are entering labor education activities, especially from the newer unions. It is too soon to know whether the special approaches will be developed which all labor educators feel are necessary.

Some labor educators see another educational need related to the preceding one. The turn-over of local union leadership is high. Young leaders being elected, the educators say, are inexperienced in unionism. Special efforts must be made to reach them if the quality of union performance is not to suffer and unionism is to continue to have broad goals.

The full-time union staff is seen as the second large group in need of expanded educational effort. We have already discussed the reasons in our section on staff training. Labor educators, more than most national union officers, would place greater emphasis on the need for staff education in social problems, but they are also concerned with the quality of staff performance in traditional union functions.

There are now two formal education programs for national union officers and executive board members: those of Brookings and of the Steelworkers. One labor educator would put a high priority on the expansion in the number of such programs. They would accomplish two goals, he feels: (1) a direct educational benefit; and (2) an experience that would help this decision-making group better understand the educational function.

Four content areas related to union efficiency were suggested as needing attention. One is the problem of bargaining with the conglomerate corporation, which operates in a number of industries and negotiates with a number of unions. The second relates to the non-economic aspects of bargaining. Some felt that organizing techniques and problems should receive more attention. Finally, it was suggested that more effective ways should be found to teach politics and political action.

Some labor educators stress the importance of new approaches to an old problem, an adequate structure for training local union officers and activists, available throughout the country. The approach most often suggested is a large-scale expansion of current programs which train instructors to teach basic subjects. The training is regarded as an opportunity for union and university cooperation in the teacher training, with the unions assuming responsibility for the administration of the courses.

The development of opportunities for individual educational advancement is considered by some a major objective for labor education. The rationale is dual: More and more of the rewards of society, including job advancement, are dependent upon education; yet most workers do not take the initiative for improving their education. At the same time, educational opportunities are growing. There is an increase in the number of literacy programs. Vocational education is expanding. High school equivalency examinations make it easier for adults to acquire a diploma. The mushrooming of community colleges has brought the possibility of at least two years of higher education into the home communities of most workers. For some unionists there are negotiated tuition-refund programs which sharply reduce the financial barrier to further education.

Labor education, it is asserted, can be the bridge between the workers' educational needs and the opportunities for meeting them at all the levels mentioned above. Both union and university educators have access to the local unions and can work with them to establish services for the required counseling and testing, as well as to organize the necessary programs at the lower level if these are not already available. There are already some examples in literacy programs and high school completion.

The academic aspects of such a development can be made meaningful to unionists through the development of a labor studies curriculum based on the problems of workers and unions. This curriculum would lead to an associate degree in a community college or could become a major field of study for a baccalaureate.

Such a development, its proponents claim, would change the character of labor education by broadening and systemizing it, and by providing a set of goals for unionist-students which would give them an incentive for continuing their education.

There are now two experiments which stress the credit aspect of this suggestion: the labor studies major at Rutgers University College, which started in the fall of 1967; and the cooperative effort of the UAW and a group of community colleges in Michigan, with the first classes to be held in the fall of 1968.

It should be noted that the emphasis on credit and a degree makes these efforts quite different from the long-term, noncredit courses which many universities are now conducting. The latter are also concerned with the education of the individual, with the added goal that he function more effectively as a unionist in the union and in society. As a result, there is less attention to traditional academic disciplines, and the course organization and teaching method can be adapted to the background and interests of the students.

Footnotes

1/ Helmut J. Golatz, "Probing the Institute Glow," Adult Education, Vol. XII, No. 2 (Winter 1962), pp. 116-19.

2/ Al Nash, "Impact of Adult Education on Taxi Drivers During an Organizing Drive," Adult Leadership, Vol. 16, No. 5 (November 1967), pp. 183-85.

Chapter VII Footnotes (cont'd)

3/ Allen Menlo, "Factors Which Influence Learning and Change; A Summary Report of Findings of a Study of Two UAW Summer School Programs" (Ann Arbor, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan-Wayne State University, October 1963), mimeo.

4/ "Evaluation of 1966 Schools for Community Union Builders, and Recommendations" (Washington, D.C., CWA Education Department, May 1968), mimeo.

5/ "UAW Leadership Studies Center, An Evaluation by Those Who Took Part" (Detroit, UAW, June 1966).

6/ Eugene C. Hagburg, "Satisfaction Provided to Labor Education Participants," Adult Leadership, Vol. 15, No. 10 (April 1967), pp. 353-55.

7/ "Preliminary Analysis, Fort Wayne Student Questionnaire" (Bloomington, Labor Research and Education Center, Indiana University), no date, mimeo.

8/ Wells Keddie, Proposal for Research on "An Evaluation of the Impact of the Union Leadership Academy on the Occupational and Citizenship Roles of Unionists," submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education by Penn State University in August 1966, p. 1.

9/ Goodwin Watson, "Residential Study Institutes for Trade Union Staff: An Evaluation Report" (Washington, D.C., National Institute of Labor Education, 1963), mimeo.

10/ "Staff Report on the 1966 Resident Labor Education Program" (Bloomington, Labor Research and Education Center, Indiana University), no date, mimeo.

11/ Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller, "Strengthening Labor's Role in the War on Poverty, Labor Leadership Training for Community Action in Appalachia" (Morgantown, Institute for Labor Studies, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1967), mimeo.

12/ Stanley Rosen, "The Recruitment and Training of Union and University Labor Educators" (Chicago, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1966), mimeo.

Appendix I

RESPONDING ORGANIZATIONS

AFL-CIO National Unions

Aluminum Workers International Union
International Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW)
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers
International Brotherhood of Bookbinders
International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers International Union
International Chemical Workers Union
Cigarmakers' International Union of America
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (ACWA)
Communications Workers of America (CWA)
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE)
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)
International Union of Operating Engineers
International Association of Fire Fighters
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union (ILGWU)
United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America
Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada
American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE)
Allied Industrial Workers of America, International Union (AIW)
International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers
Laborers' International Union of North America
Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM)
National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America
International Molders and Allied Workers Union, AFL-CIO
American Newspaper Guild (ANG)
Office and Professional Employees International Union
Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW)
United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America
United Federation of Postal Clerks
Retail Clerks International Association
United Slate, Tile and Composition Roofers, Damp and Waterproof Workers Association
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America
Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
United Steelworkers of America

Responding Organizations: National Unions (continued)

American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
United Textile Workers of America (UTW)
Textile Workers Union of America (TWUA)
Upholsterers' International Union of North America

AFL-CIO Departments

Metal Trades Department

Independent Unions

National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE)
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers (BLE)
National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees
Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen

AFL-CIO State Central Bodies

Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, and Washington

AFL-CIO Local Central Bodies

California: Contra Costa County (Martinez) and Los Angeles County
Connecticut: Bridgeport
Illinois: Chicago
Louisiana: New Orleans
Michigan: Oakland County (Pontiac)
Minnesota: St. Paul
Ohio: Canton, Cincinnati, and Cleveland
Oregon: Multnomah County (Portland)
Pennsylvania: Allegheny County (Pittsburgh)
Tennessee: Memphis
Texas: Harris County (Houston)
Wisconsin: Milwaukee County

Responding Organizations (continued)

University Labor Education Centers (*)(+)

Advanced Study Program, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California, Berkeley
Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California, Los Angeles
Center for Labor Education and Research, University of Colorado
Labor Education Center, University of Connecticut
N.Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University
Trade Union Program, Harvard University, Boston
Labor-Management Education Program, Industrial Relations Center, University of Hawaii
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois
Labor Education and Research Center, Indiana University
Labor Services, Center for Labor and Management, University of Iowa
Bureau of Labor Education, University of Maine
Labor Relations and Research Center, University of Massachusetts
Labor Program Service, School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University
Division of Labor Education and Services, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan - Wayne State University, Ann Arbor
Labor Education Service, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota
Labor Education Program, University of Missouri
Labor Education and Research Service, Ohio State University
Department of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University
Division of Labor Education, Roosevelt University, Chicago
Labor Program, Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers
Institute of Labor Studies, West Virginia University
School for Workers, University of Wisconsin

(*) The university questionnaire was also sent to the two following non-university institutions:
 Workers' Education Program, Trade and Industrial Education Service, Alabama State Department of Education; and
 Labor Education Program, Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia.

(+) Labor education centers were established at the following universities after the survey was under way:
 The American University, Washington, D.C.
 Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg

Responding Organizations (continued)

State Directors of Vocational Education

Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming

State Directors of Cooperative Extension Service

Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia

Appendix II

STAFF TRAINING: HISTORY AND CURRENT PROGRAMS

There has been some training of union staff since the end of World War II. The Harvard Trade Union Program, directed toward increasing the general competence of experienced full-time staff, started a nine-month course in 1942, shifting to 13 weeks in 1948. The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union began a quite different kind of program when it established its Training Institute in 1950. This program was directed to staff recruits, mostly from outside the industry, and it provided 12 months of training equally divided between the classroom and the field. The Institute in this form was discontinued in 1961. Since then it has concentrated on a four-week training period for newly employed staff.

In 1951 the Communications Workers of America made regular staff training a part of its educational activity. Programs for staff have continued in various forms since then, with the emphasis on a six-month program for new staff since 1961.

The Harvard and the ILGWU projects were major continuing efforts. At the same time some individual unions offered spot training for all or part of their staff, usually to meet specific problems in organizing or bargaining.

Following the merger of the AFL and the CIO in 1955, the Industrial Union Department conducted a series of inter-union projects on such subjects as arbitration and organizing. Specialized training in industrial engineering was begun by the University of Wisconsin School for Workers in 1957. One year later this became a cooperative program with the AFL-CIO Department of Research and has continued in this form. National unions began to work with the IUD and the university labor centers, usually on specific training projects but sometimes in a broad program as was the case with the International Chemical Workers Union in 1961.

These programs were intended directly to improve staff skills or to include a major element with this objective. The five 10-week resident institutes of the National Institute of Labor Education in 1961 and 1962 had a different purpose. They concentrated on the social sciences and were conducted by four university labor education centers. There was a similar purpose, if quite a different method, in a series of three-week institutes held later by the IUD.

We shall describe below those staff-training activities on which we have obtained information. We have not included unions that organize educational activities in conjunction with staff meetings; nor locally organized staff training, usually conducted in conjunction with a university labor education center. We have also omitted staff programs of specialized sections of the union movement (the AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, for example).

Current Inter-Union Programs

Harvard

The Harvard Trade Union Program draws between 15 and 20 union representatives to a 13-week session. Two of these are held each year. The courses provide an in-depth study of practical union subjects such as labor law, union administration, and bargaining, with a background of labor history and economics. Courses are taught chiefly by Harvard faculty using the case method. Most of the students come from national union staff, generally those on the way up. There is a sprinkling of local unionists who receive scholarships from labor groups. National unions that send students to the classes tend to do so repeatedly; they are primarily unions that do not have established internal education programs. There is also usually a group of foreign trade-unionists in attendance, visiting the United States on government-sponsored grants. Sixty-nine U.S. unionists attended the Harvard program during the two years of our survey.

AFL-CIO Industrial Engineering Institutes

The AFL-CIO Department of Research, in conjunction with the University of Wisconsin School for Workers, conducts an annual two-week industrial engineering institute on the campus of the university at Madison. The subject matter is broken down into parallel courses dealing with various aspects of industrial engineering so that a more complete treatment can be given to each, and a staff representative who returns for the various programs can obtain a rounded training. About 60 staff representatives participate in each session, coming from an assortment of unions that face industrial engineering problems in their bargaining activities. Instructors are from the AFL-CIO, the university, and unions with experts in the field.

Related in part to this program, the AFL-CIO Department of Research in March 1967 joined with the University of Iowa labor education center in a one-week institute on testing which enrolled 26.

AFL-CIO Collective Bargaining Institute

The AFL-CIO Departments of Research and Education cooperate in sponsoring an annual collective bargaining institute dealing with the economics and techniques of bargaining. Instruction is directed toward both national and local staff, particularly in those industries in which bargaining is decentralized. Sessions have been held in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin and Michigan State University. These were one-week programs in 1965 and 1966, and a 10-day program in 1967. Twenty attended the 1967 program.

Current Inter-Union Programs (continued)

AFL-CIO Discussion Leadership

In 1966 and 1967 the AFL-CIO Department of Education conducted one-week training sessions in discussion leadership, primarily for union education staff. Attendance was 30 in 1966 and 25 in 1967. The program concentrated on teaching techniques for workers' classes.

Advanced Southern Labor School

AFL-CIO state central bodies in the south cooperate in educational activity through the Southern Labor School. Each year this organization, working with the AFL-CIO Department of Education, sponsors a one-week school, the Advanced Southern Labor School, for full-time central body staff, dealing with their problems as central body officers. As contrasted with the bargaining-organizing focus of programs for national union representatives, this institute concentrates on the political, legislative, and social questions of the south, both in background information and the practical problems of implementing union programs. In recent years the staff of national unions from the area have been involved in the program so that there are equal numbers from national unions and central bodies. Attendance is about 40 each year.

NILE Southern Staff Training

In cooperation with the AFL-CIO Department of Education, the National Institute of Labor Education sponsored three four-week institutes for southern union staff. These were held in 1963, 1965, and 1966, at the Universities of North Carolina, Texas, and Georgia. The faculty wa drawn from the AFL-CIO and national unions, and from universities throughout the south. The curriculum focused on trade union skills and the problems peculiar to southern unionism, with special attention to civil rights. Fifty-seven southern unionists, mostly from national union staffs, attended the three schools, about the same number in each. Foundation grants assisted in financing these projects.

AFL-CIO Metal Trades Department

As a part of its educational program with local Metal Trades Councils operating in federal installations, the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Department in 1966 brought together 81 of the responsible staff of affiliated unions and local councils for two regional collective bargaining conferences: one lasting three days, the other one week. These sessions dealt with the particular problems of collective bargaining under the federal executive order. A west coast session was held in 1968. The program was planned in cooperation with the AFL-CIO Department of Education, which also assists in the teaching.

National Union Staff Training

UAW Leadership Studies Center

The UAW is the only union which now has a separate internal institution exclusively for staff training, intended to provide such training on a variety of subjects for the entire staff of the union. The UAW Leadership Studies Center is located at union headquarters in Detroit. The Center has a faculty of five, and uses other resources from the union and from universities and other institutions.

During the period of the NILE study, the Center concentrated on completing a series of three-week seminars for the servicing staff of the union. Groups of about 15 concentrated on the problems of a "simulated union," in bargaining, internal administration, politics, and relations with other unions and the community. There was a special program on reading skills, and attention was focused on some problems beyond the immediate concerns of the union. For the latter, use was made of the state universities in the area. A high proportion of the union's servicing staff has now participated in this training. A special program for the organizers preceded it.

In addition to these general programs, the Center has also trained union staff and key local union officers in international labor problems, has conducted a special one-week session for regional UAW publicity representatives, and has run a series of eight four-day seminars based on the report of the Commission on Automation and Technology. The latter were conducted on a regional basis throughout the country, using academic economists and sociologists as well as Center staff as faculty.

New programs now being initiated will provide special skill training in such fields as time-study and arbitration, or will deal with the economies and special problems of a section of the union, such as agricultural implements. A special training program for new staff is also being planned.

The Center pays particular attention to the preparation of training materials. The simulated union mentioned above is a carefully drafted description of a local union and its total environment. Included are details about the members and officers, including age, sex, and ethnic mix; the company, the contract, the collective bargaining relationship, the community, and the state where the plants are and the members live; the political and social situation; and other unions including the central labor union. A series of questions focuses on problems in every area of union concern: in the local, in relations with the company, and in the community. Classes are organized around these questions, using a variety of techniques.

The Center has also developed programmed materials for instruction in pension and health and welfare bargaining and its own materials to improve reading skills.

National Union Staff Training, UAW (cont'd)

During the two-year period 1965 and 1966, 219 UAW representatives participated in 15 Center programs, 12 of which were seminars for servicing staff and 3 the international labor training. The organizer training took place before that time and the other activities since.

Communications Workers of America

The Communications Workers of America have conducted staff training in some form since 1951. One of the executive vice presidents is in charge.

Since 1961 the emphasis has been on a six-month induction program for new staff. This includes 12 weeks of academic instruction, 6 or 7 weeks of headquarters training, and 4 weeks of field experience. The academic section is conducted for CWA by a university labor education center, most recently Michigan-Wayne. Using university instructors, special courses are provided in the social sciences, particularly as they relate to workers' problems but avoiding the training directly related to union staff work.

At union headquarters the training is partially skill-oriented and partially an opportunity to become better acquainted with the resources and services of the union headquarters, the AFL-CIO, and other Washington-based organizations. For field experience the trainees are assigned to organizing, sometimes in a CWA campaign, sometimes with AFL-CIO regional staff.

During 1965 and 1966 two groups of new staff totaling 28 went through this training. Because there are no staff openings the program is not in operation in 1968. A total of 54 new staff have had this orientation since it began.

The training for experienced staff is now conducted occasionally. The most recent sessions took place in 1967 at a resort. About 150 of the staff were divided into three groups of which one was composed of staff members who supervised others. The emphasis was on problem-solving, planning, and motivating others for union work. An outside consultant who developed the program in cooperation with CWA, was the major training resource.

International Ladies' Garment Workers Union

The Training Institute of the ILGWU is part of the union's education department. Two types of program are conducted. Each year there are two four-week sessions for newly hired staff sent by the subordinate units of the union. The ILGWU structure is such that nearly all staff are attached to subordinate units. Attendance ranges from 10 to 15. The curriculum includes union history and structure, bargaining, particularly contract enforcement, industry economics and practices, general social problems, and specific skill training. This is a continuing program.

National Union Staff Training, ILGWU (cont'd)

The Training Institute also provides training in specified subjects for the experienced staff of subordinate units of the union. Labor law, contract enforcement, organizing, and political action were among the subjects taught during the two-year period of this study. Attendance at the sessions totaled about 250. Some of the training was given in short, intensive, full-time conferences while other training consisted of continuing classes meeting once a week. Instructors came from the union.

United Steelworkers of America

In the spring of 1966 the United Steelworkers of America established a staff development and training institute, the Clinton S. Golden Center, to provide three weeks of training to groups of not more than 20. The Center is run by the union's education department and is housed in special facilities in Pittsburgh not far from the union headquarters. Newcomers and established staff are trained together, with not more than two from any one region at the Center at one time.

The program concentrates on sophisticated instruction in tool subjects and places emphasis on economics, which is regarded as a supporting tool. The union's headquarters staff does the teaching, all three national officers participating in each program. A course in reading improvement is provided and reading is stressed in relation to the classes.

By April 1968 there had been ten programs enrolling 169. This is to be a continuing activity. All new staff are required to attend, and it is hoped that all 700 of the union's staff will participate.

A special one-week orientation program was conducted for the staff of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers at the time of its merger with the United Steelworkers in 1967.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America

Since most of the paid staff in the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen are employed by the locals, the union's staff training is directed primarily toward this group.

Each year the union education department holds two or three one-week sessions, for groups of about 35, at union headquarters in Chicago, with the cooperation of Roosevelt University. The programs deal with developments within the union and the industry and with collective bargaining and organizing. Instructors are drawn from the union, the university, and occasionally from the industry. There are also advanced staff institutes which last two weeks and explore some subjects in greater depth. They may deal with more sophisticated topics or with those less directly related to immediate problems of the union.

To assist in the union's education program, the education department also trains local staff in educational methods. This training

National Union Staff Training, Meat Cutters (cont'd)

takes place in one-week sessions. A special program brings together local union office secretaries for one week of education about unionism.

During 1965 and 1966, 109 union staff representatives participated in four schools.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

For several years the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has conducted a continuing staff program based on a manual of instruction prepared at national headquarters and updated regularly. The manual includes union policy and structure, some economics, and labor history. Training of the national staff is conducted by the regional vice presidents. The staff use the same manual to train the local business agents. During 1965 and 1966 there were 12 regional two-day conferences, attended by 250.

In 1967 the union started a series of staff institutes providing intensive "how-to-do-it" training in specific subjects. Thus far, two institutes have been held, each a week long: Arbitration at the University of Illinois; and NLRB Procedures at Cornell. Twenty-five selected national union representatives attended each of these. Instruction came from the union, the university involved, and outside experts.

International Association of Machinists

The International Association of Machinists now conducts regular orientation programs for new staff at the union headquarters. Each year separate sessions are held for new grand lodge representatives, nationally employed; and for new business representatives, locally employed and partially financed by the national union. The program deals with headquarters services and includes sessions on labor law and organizing. The IAM headquarters vice president is in charge. Seventy-one new staff members attended such sessions in 1966.

Prior to the start of this activity the education department conducted one-week schools for business representatives, similar in format to union one-week schools. In 1965 and 1966, 176 business representatives attended these sessions.

Allied Industrial Workers

The education department of the Allied Industrial Workers conducts an annual training conference for the 60 members of its national staff, concentrating on a single subject such as organizing or a specific aspect of collective bargaining. Carefully prepared materials are used as the basis of the training. The department works with the labor education staff of a university in the preparation of these materials and the teaching. Sessions have been held at the University of Wisconsin and at Michigan State.

National Union Staff Training (continued)

American Federation of Government Employees

The rapid growth of the American Federation of Government Employees has been accompanied by the development of a major education program that includes staff training. All of the national staff, a total of 65, participated in a one-week program on white-collar organizing at the University of Minnesota in 1965. This was followed in 1966 and 1967 by one-week institutes on collective bargaining for selected groups of 25 at Michigan State University. The union's education department conducts this activity.

Textile Workers Union of America

Over the years the Textile Workers Union of America has conducted occasional staff-training programs to meet specific needs. This activity stopped when the union lost its education director, but it has been resumed now that a new director has been appointed. In 1967 and again in 1968 the union held one-week sessions for new organizers, bringing together at Rutgers about 20 people for each program. There is an effort to develop progression in the training. Instructors come from the union, from universities, and from the AFL-CIO.

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

The AFSCME at present is expanding its staff-training program. During 1965 and 1966 the union conducted a series of 12 three-day conferences, dealing primarily with collective bargaining problems, for 190 national and council staff. In 1967 it held a special program for 14 staff interns consisting of four weeks of classes and eight weeks of field experience. An experimental two-week program for 20 experienced union staff from the national union and the councils was held in 1968 in cooperation with American University. The subject matter concentrated on the problems of organizing and collective bargaining for state and local government employees, with instructors drawn from the union and from the field of public personnel. A continuing program of one-week sessions has now been established.

Upholsterers' International Union

Regular one-week training sessions for local business agents are held on a regional basis by the Upholsterers' International Union in conjunction with university labor education centers. During 1965 and 1966 three such programs were held, one each at UCLA, Penn State, and Roosevelt, drawing a total of 55 participants. Sessions were held on political action, labor history, and wage calculation including time study. During this same period 32 local union representatives attended two series of eight-week classes, once a week, conducted by the union staff.

National Union Staff Training (continued)

Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers

The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers now hold orientation sessions at the union headquarters for their new staff in groups of 10 or less. During 1965 and 1966 the union's education department held two special two-week programs on labor law and health, welfare, and pension bargaining. These were attended by 50 representatives. Special programs were also conducted for 39 staff representatives in conjunction with the union's one-week schools.

International Union of Electrical Workers

The International Union of Electrical Workers has held occasional staff-training sessions to meet specific needs. A three-day session at the end of March 1968 brought together 130 of the union's field representatives for sessions on organizing and pension and insurance bargaining. Instructors came from the union headquarters staff and from the AFL-CIO.

International Chemical Workers Union

In recent years the International Chemical Workers Union has used organizing campaigns for on-the-job training of potential staff. Five or six active local officers are assigned as a group to work for three months with an experienced organizer on a specific campaign. The organizing activity is supplemented by discussion sessions conducted by the organizer in charge and others from the regional and national offices of the union. These classes include material on union policy, labor law, and other subjects, as well as the problems that arise in organizing. There have been three such groups, involving 16 local officers.

In 1961 the union held a special training program for its entire field staff divided into small groups for training purposes. The program covered the entire range of union activity.

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America

In 1967 the Painters' union conducted a series of 11 two-day staff conferences throughout the country for the small national staff and the far larger number of local union business agents. About 2,000 attended.

Half a day each was devoted to organizing, bargaining, local union administration, and internal union problems. Instructors came from the AFL-CIO on occasion from universities, and from the union itself. The AFL-CIO Department of Education assisted in developing the program.

International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers of the United States and Canada

In 1968 the Pulp, Sulphite and Papermill Workers inaugurated a training program for its national union staff of about 90. This program consisted of three regional one-week schools including sessions on organizing, bargaining (including arbitration), union structure, political action, and some attention to broader social issues. Instructors came from AFL-CIO departments, from universities, and from the union. The AFL-CIO Department of Education assisted in developing the program.

Retail Clerks International Association

The Retail Clerks International Association conducts biennial one-week training programs for the full-time local union staff. About 80 percent of the training time is devoted to practical problems of organizing, collective bargaining, and union administration, subjects that are taught by field experts of the national union staff. The remaining time is spent on social problems, using instructors from the universities where the programs are taking place. Three such sessions were held in 1966 at the Universities of Massachusetts, Purdue, and Colorado, a total of 500 enrolled.

Laborers' International Union of North America

There have recently been two staff-training programs of the Laborers' International Union. A four-day conference on the problems of organizing public employees was held by the national union, with 37 enrolled. One region of the union sponsored a two-week program in conjunction with Indiana University for 33 representatives of local unions, 20 of whom were full-time staff. The curriculum dealt chiefly with union policies and problems and tool subjects. Most of the instruction came from union staff. The national union education department cooperated with the region and the university in developing and carrying out this venture.

American Newspaper Guild

During the period of the NILE survey, 1965 and 1966, the American Newspaper Guild held a one-week training session for 12 newer national union staff and local executive secretaries. The program involved organizing, including NLRB procedures, bargaining, and strikes.

The United Brick and Clay Workers of America

The 30 members of the Brick and Clay Workers' national staff were brought to Washington in 1966 for a one week training program which concentrated on organizing and bargaining problems. The program was planned and conducted in cooperation with the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

Appendix III

STUDENTS IN SHORT COURSES GIVEN BY THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LABOR STUDIES CENTER IN COOPERATION WITH THE GREATER WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO, FALL 1967 AND SPRING 1968

The registration cards used by The American University Labor Studies Center provide information on student characteristics. This information was used to develop the following tables. The profile is not typical of trade unionists who take inter-union short courses because the union movement in the Washington metropolitan area is unlike that elsewhere: (1) There is almost no manufacturing industry, and there is a high proportion of government workers, many of whom have recently been organized. (2) This was the first education program for both the university and the central labor union, and attendance at the classes represented a new educational opportunity for active unionists in the area. (3) Two of the nine courses were set up primarily for full-time staff, making a higher proportion than usual of full-time staff in the classes.

The tabulations cover registrations for seven different courses as follows: Fall 1967: Labor History (2 sections); Public Employee Collective Bargaining (2 sections); The National Labor Relations Board (for full-time staff). Spring 1968: Labor History; Communications; Labor and the American Political System; Economics and Collective Bargaining (for full-time staff).

These tables are based upon registrations. About ten percent of the registrants did not attend regularly enough to receive a certificate.

App. III-1

STUDENTS IN SHORT COURSES
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LABOR STUDIES CENTER
FALL 1967 AND SPRING 1968 [1]

	Staff Courses		Open Courses		Attended 2 or More Courses [2]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sex: Male	84	98.8	129	82.2	39	90.7
Female	1	1.2	28	17.8	4	9.3
Totals	85		157		43	
Full-Time Staff	72	84.7	46	29.3	31	72.1
Not Full-Time Staff	12	14.1	93	59.2	12	27.9
No Answer	1	1.2	18	11.5	0	--
Years in present Union:						
1 and 2	4	4.7	25	15.9	4	9.3
3 - 5	6	7.1	29	18.5	6	14.0
6 - 10	7	8.2	35	22.3	10	23.2
11 - 20	35	41.2	49	31.2	13	30.3
21 plus	33	38.8	18	11.5	10	23.2
no answer	0	--	1	6.4	0	--
Age:						
under 25	4	4.7	4	2.5	0	--
25 - 29	2	2.4	21	13.4	1	2.3
30 - 34	11	12.9	29	18.5	5	11.6
35 - 44	23	27.1	54	34.4	5	11.6
45 - 54	33	38.8	32	20.4	15	34.9
55 plus	11	12.9	16	10.2	15	34.9
no answer	1	1.2	1	0.6	2	4.7
Education (last year completed)						
1 - 8	3	3.5	4	2.5	0	--
9 - 11	22	25.9	16	10.2	9	20.9
12	37	43.5	85	54.1	23	53.5
13 - 15 (college 1-3)	17	20.0	32	20.4	7	16.3
16 (college 4)	4	5.9	17	12.7	4	9.3
17 (above B.A.)	1		3		0	
no answer	1	1.2	0	--	0	--

---

[1] Those registering for more than one course are counted only once in all three tabulations.

[2] Staff courses and open courses are combined for this column.

App. III-2

UNION MEMBERSHIP OF STUDENTS IN SHORT COURSES AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LABOR STUDIES CENTER FALL 1967 and SPRING 1968 [1]

Union	Staff Courses	Open Courses	Attended 2 or More Courses [2]
Laborers	12	0	2
Carpenters	12	8	9
Hotel and Restaurant	6	3	1
Typographers	6	5	3
Operating Engineers	5	4	3
Plumbers & Pipefitters	5	3	3
Retail Clerks	5	5	1
Pressmen	4	3	2
IBEW	3	5	2
Teamsters	3	3	3
Painters	3	0	0
Plasterers	3	0	0
Service Employees	3	7	3
American Bakery Workers	2	2	0
Lithographers	2	13	1
Sheet Metal Workers	2	3	1
AFSCME	1	21	3
Amalgamated Transit Workers	1	2	0
Bookbinders	1	2	0
CWA	1	0	0
Elevator Constructors	1	6	2
Lathers	1	2	0
Office Workers	1	13	3
Teachers	1	1	1
AFGE	0	17	0
Postal Clerks	0	14	0
Fire Fighters	0	8	0
Letter Carriers	0	3	0
Firemen & Oilers	0	1	0
Asbestos Workers	0	1	0
No Answer	1	2	0
Totals	85	157	43

1/ Those registering for more than one course are counted only once in all three tabulations.

2/ Staff courses and open courses are combined for this column.

App. III-3

UNION POSITION HELD
BY STUDENTS IN SHORT COURSES
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LABOR STUDIES CENTER
FALL 1967 and SPRING 1968 [1]

Name of Position [2]	Staff Courses	Open Courses	Attended 2 or More Courses [3]
President or Chairman	6	21	3
Vice President	2	8	0
Business Agent or Organizer	57	28	28
Secy.-Treas. or Treasurer	7	8	3
Secretary	3	4	0
Committee Chairman or Member	1	7	2
Assistant to President	1	0	0
Legislative Representative	1	0	0
Director, Joint Trade Board	1	0	0
Executive Board Member	1	23	3
Officer Apprentice Assoc.	2	0	0
Shop Steward	0	21	0
Director, Research & Education	0	1	0
Trustee or similar office	0	5	0
None	0	12	3
No Answer	3	19	1
Totals	85	157	43

---

[1] Those registering for more than one course are counted only once in all three tabulations.

[2] Similar jobs listed differently have been combined.

[3] Staff courses and open courses are combined for this column.

Appendix IV

EFFECTIVE COOPERATION BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND UNIONS IN LABOR EDUCATION

Statement developed by a group of union-university
labor educators at a joint meeting of the
AFL-CIO Education Directors and the
University Labor Education Association
Rutgers University   April 30, 1962

I. Premises:

Universities can and should render genuine educational services to organized labor groups, just as they have been rendering such services for many years to business, farmers, and other functional groups in our society. These services are provided in undergraduate and graduate schools of business; in agricultural colleges and a vast program of agricultural extension; in professional schools of various kinds; and through specialized training in a variety of fields.

University-labor cooperation in the field of education must take place in a climate of mutual respect and confidence. It must be predicated upon a sincere acceptance by the university of the broad goals of unionism and the processes of collective bargaining as a vital and integral part of a democratic society.

Further, it requires of universities an acceptance of the principles and methods of workers' education and of its institutional channels within the unions. And it requires of unions a recognition of the need of universities to maintain objectivity, intellectual integrity, and standards of teaching.

II. Scope:

The purpose of labor education is to better equip union leaders, potential leaders, and interested members as trade unionists and citizens. Education can provide training in specific skills and background knowledge which will be useful in the operation of the union and in the relationship between unions and the rest of society.

It is doubtful that any practical line can be drawn at this time between the appropriate spheres for university labor education programs and those conducted directly by the unions. There are a few training goals clearly outside the province of university labor education, such as the building of loyalty to a specific union or the implementation of a specific political action program. On the other hand, there are some areas clearly appropriate to university workers' education, such as broad general education, teacher and leadership training, learning having to do with the growth and development of individuals rather than organizations, and experimental efforts in techniques, materials, and new subject matter.

The specific program of any university will depend on the needs of the unions as expressed in the cooperative relationships described below, and on the special interests and competence of the university. In general, universities should not attempt to do what unions can and ought to do for themselves. The most creative relationships are those between strong union-supported education programs and equally strong programs of universities. University participation in labor education should enhance and elevate the over-all program but should not be a substitute for the work of the unions themselves. When the university works with unions that have not developed their own programs, a major objective of the university should be to encourage this development.

III. Administration:

The labor education program should have an identity of its own within the university. This is necessary even when the program is located within an industrial relations center or as part of an extension division. It does require specialized staff familiar with the problems of labor education and willing to accept a cooperative relationship between the union and the university. This staff should be knowledgeable about trade unionism and its problems, experienced in all phases of adult education for workers, and able to administer and conduct a varied program with competence and imagination. Both the program and the staff should have recognition within the university because of the importance of the work, not as a by-product of other accomplishments such as research or publication.

Participation in workers' education classes is almost invariably voluntary. Therefore, a university program, as a matter of policy and in order to be effective, must involve unions and workers closely in its planning and conduct. This cooperative relationship should apply to the specific activities and, more important, to the over-all program. This last can be best assured through the establishment of an advisory committee to the labor education program. The following guideposts for the operation of such a committee are suggested.

The committee should include representatives of the university and of labor unions. (When the labor education program is part of a joint labor-management institute or department of the university, there is often a committee including management, unions, and the public to advise on the total program. In such instances there should be a separate committee advising on the labor education program that is made up of union and university representatives.) The committee should be large enough to be representative but not so large as to be unwieldy. Selection of the labor representatives should be the result of a consultative process between the university and the representative body of the labor movement in the area being served. In the case of state universities the state central body is the logical channel for the cooperative effort. Universities serving only a local area might deal with the local central body. Those universities with a national concern should keep this in mind in the establishment of their committees.

A number of universities have found a successful procedure in selecting labor members of advisory committees in nomination by the responsible central labor body and appointment by the university. The union representatives should include a combination of responsible union officials, representatives of international unions with sizeable membership in the area, and union education professionals from the area if they are available. There should also be some representation on the committee of union educators with national experience to encourage the sharing of experiences throughout the country.

Both the union and the university representatives on the advisory committee have the responsibility for the success of the program. This is best accomplished when a creative relationship is established, bonded by a common concern. In this way the committee can be more than a watchdog for the labor movement or a promotional agency for the university. Some specific functions of the committee follow:

1. Interpretation to the university of the educational needs of the labor movement. This includes the types of programs, the teachers and the materials to make the programs effective, and the geographical areas for activity. It should also include the administrative relationship between the university and the unions, and problems of cost.

2. Serving as an opportunity for the review of university proposals. In the operation of the program it is expected that ideas will come from both sides. The joint meetings will encourage this, and serve to test them.

3. Interpretation of the university program within the labor movement, including the promotion of university labor education activities.

4. Helping to interpret the program in the community so that there is public understanding of the role of the university in labor education.

5. Building support for the program within the university, including adequate financing.

6. Providing an opportunity for interchange of ideas which will lead not only to experiments in education but also to research opportunities of mutual concern.

IV. Costs:

University labor education programs are sufficiently important that university funds should be available for their support. This support should include administrative expenses and at least part of instructional costs. Public funds or endowments provide the bulk of the funds for college and university education. There is no reason why they should not meet an equivalent share of the cost of labor education activity.

Appendix V

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ACTIVITIES OF UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS

NAME OF INSTITUTION ____

Name of Program ____

Name of Person in Charge ____

Address ____

City ____________________ State ______________ Telephone __________

NAME OF PERSON REPORTING ____

SUMMARY OF LABOR EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
Two-Year Period: January 1, 1965, to December 31, 1966

1. Extension Courses Not Part of a Continuing Sequence of Courses, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966. (The term "extension" is used to describe part-time classes in the home community of the student.)

	No. of Courses	No. of Students Completing Course	No. of Students Registered
4 sessions	___	___	___
5 sessions	___	___	___
6 sessions	___	___	___
7 sessions	___	___	___
8 sessions	___	___	___
9 sessions	___	___	___
10 sessions	___	___	___
More than 10 sessions ___ (indicate how many)	___	___	___

Of the above courses:

How many were designed for full-time union staff?	___	___	___
How many were conducted for a single local union?	___	___	___
How many were conducted for several locals of one union?	___	___	___

1. **Extension Courses Not Part of a Continuing Sequence of Courses (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)--(continued)**

Of the above courses:

	No. of Courses	No. of Students
How many were conducted for officers and delegates of a central labor body?	___	___
How many were general courses for a central labor body?	___	___

Average time of single class session: ___hours

2. **Long-Term, Non-Resident Programs** (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)

Did you conduct a long-term, non-resident program? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please answer the following questions and send any literature describing program, including course titles.

Program title____

Length of each course: ___ sessions.

No. of courses: ___ No. of students: ___

No. of courses required to complete program: ___

Please indicate if program is on annual rather than on course basis and provide information accordingly.

How long has university conducted the program? ___years

Dropout rate (if available):
End of first course or semester ___
End of first year ___
End of second year ___
End of third year (if applicable) ___

Have course descriptions, special readings, or bibliographies been prepared for this program? Yes___ No___

If possible, please send copies; otherwise list course areas for which readings or bibliographies exist.

____

____

____

____

2. Long-Term, Non-Resident Programs (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)--(continued)

Approximately what proportion of students are full-time staff? ___None

___Less than 10% ___11 to 25% ___26 to 50% ___More than 50%

Is the program conducted in cooperation with other universities? Yes___ No___
If Yes, list them:

____

____

____

3. Non-Resident Programs for Full-Time Union Staff (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)

3a. Has your institution conducted full-time non-resident programs for full-time union staff? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please provide the following information:

Program title______________________________

Name of union______________________________

No. of sessions___ No. of students___

Program title______________________________

Name of union______________________________

No. of sessions___ No. of students___

Program title______________________________

Name of union______________________________

No. of sessions___ No. of students___

3b. Has your institution conducted half-time, non-resident programs for full-time union staff? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please provide the following information:

Program title______________________________

Name of union______________________________

No. of sessions___ Length of each session_______ No. of students___

Program title______________________________

Name of union______________________________

No. of sessions___ Length of each session_______ No. of students___

4. **Resident Programs for Full-Time Staff** (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)

Please answer the following questions if your institution has conducted resident programs one week or longer for full-time union staff.

4a. One-week program, single union

Program title ____________________

Name of union ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

Program title ____________________

Name of union ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

Program title ____________________

Name of union ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

4b. One-week program, inter-union

Program title ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

Program title ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

4c. Two-week program, single union

Name of union ____________________

Program title ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

4d. Two-week program, inter-union

Program title ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

Program title ____________________

No. of programs like this ___ No. of students ___

4. Resident Programs for Full-Time Staff (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)--(continued)

4e. Programs longer than two weeks

Program title______________________________

Name of union (if single union)____________________

Length of program__________ No. of programs like this____

No. of students_____

Program title______________________________

Name of union (if single union)____________________

Length of program__________ No. of programs like this____

No. of students ____

5. Resident Programs for Other Than Full-Time Staff (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)

5a. One-week programs (If your reports include this information, please indicate pages where information can be found.)

Single Union No. of programs__ No. of students__

Please list unions.

5. Resident Programs for Other Than Full-Time Staff (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)

5a. One-week programs (continued)

Central Labor Body (name)____

No. of programs___ No. of students___

Please list program titles.

Other Inter-Union (These would be programs attended by members of more than one union, but not sponsored by a central labor body.)

No. of programs___ No. of students___

Please list program titles.

5b. Programs longer than one week

Single Union (name of union)____

Length of program__________________ No. of students____

(name of union)____

Length of program__________________ No. of students____

(name of union)____

Length of program__________________ No. of students____

Inter-Union

Program title____

Length of program__________________ No. of students____

Program title____

Length of program__________________ No. of students____

Please list cooperating union organizations, if any.

____

____

____

6. Resident Conferences or Institutes (less than 5 days) for Other Than Full-Time Staff (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)

6a. Single Union	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	____	____
2-day	____	____
3-day	____	____
4-day	____	____

Please list unions and conference titles.

6b. Central Labor Body (name)________________________________

	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	____	____
2-day	____	____
More than 2 days	____	____

Please list conference titles.

6. Resident Conferences or Institutes (less than 5 days) for Other Than Full-Time Staff (Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966)--(continued)

6c. Other Inter-Union	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	___	___
2-day	___	___
More than 2 days	___	___

Please list conference titles.

7. Non-Resident Conferences and Institutes for Other Than Full-Time Staff (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)

7a. Single Union	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	___	___
2-day	___	___
More than 2 days	___	___

Please list unions and conference titles.

7. Non-Resident Conferences and Institutes for Other Than Full-Time Staff (January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966)--(continued)

7b. Central Labor Body	No.of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	___	___
More than 1 day	___	___

Please list CLU's and conference titles.

7c. Other Inter-Union	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
1-day	___	___
More than 1 day	___	___

Please list conference titles.

8. Some institutions provide individual education programs at local union or central body meetings, or at other union functions. These programs may consist of movies and discussions, lectures, or single classes. They would not include those activities intended to promote educational programs.

Did you provide these during the period January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1966? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please state no. of programs: _____

Please describe briefly the kinds of activities and the character of the audiences.

9. Some institutions provide an educational consulting service to unions, to assist them in planning educational activity in which the university may or may not participate.

Did you provide this service during the period January 1, 1965 to December 31, 1966? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please state no. of consultations: _____

Please describe briefly the kinds of groups served and the character of this service.

10. Joint Union-Management Educational Activity

Please describe briefly.

11. Special Programs Not Included in Above

List titles.

Please send reports or other descriptive material.

UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION STAFF AND STRUCTURE

The ULEA has agreed to let us use the results of the Minnesota study. Please complete your copy and return it to Jack Flagler if you have not already done so.

12. Teachers
(Other Than Those on Labor Education Staff)

12a. What proportion of extension courses are taught by part-time teachers?

Check appropriate space:

__none __less than 25% __26-50% __more than 50%

12b. What proportion of resident classes are taught by part-time teachers?

Check appropriate space:

__none __less than 25% __26-50% __more than 50%

12c. Estimate proportion of part-time teachers drawn from each of the following areas:

Your own university_________ Other academic institutions_________

Unions_________ Government_________ Industry_________

Schoolteachers_________ Independent professionals_________

12d. Do you have academic faculty at your university who devote an allocated portion of time to labor education teaching? Yes__ No__

If Yes, how many? ____

On average, what portion of time (check appropriate space):

__less than 25% __26-50% __more than 50%

12e. What is your rate of pay for part-time teachers?

Extension courses: $__________per class session

Resident courses: $__________per class session

13. Charges to Unions

13a. For extension classes:

13b. For short-term (1- and 2-week) resident programs (do not include board & room):

On campus

Off campus

13c. For 1- and 2-day conferences and institutes (do not include board & room):

On campus

Off campus

13d. For educational consultation (if any charge):

13e. Other (including special programs):

13f. If you have a formula for setting charges to unions, please describe.

Appendix VI

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL UNION EDUCATION PROGRAMS

NAME OF UNION ____________________

Address ____________________

City __________ State __________ Zip ______ Telephone __________

Name of person in charge of education program ____________________

Title ____________________

Title of person (or group) to whom the person in charge of education reports:

____

Name of person reporting: ____________________

Do other departments of the national union conduct educational programs? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please list the departments:

____

____

____

____

Please include in this report educational activities conducted by the departments listed above. If you cannot do so, please note in the space below.

NATIONAL UNION EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE TWO YEARS JANUARY 1, 1965 - DECEMBER 31, 1966

Please check appropriate spaces for activity during survey period and provide details as directed.

1. Did the union conduct special training programs for full-time staff? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _3_, Question _1_.

2. Did the union hold planned educational sessions at staff meetings? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _4_, Question _2_.

3. Did the union participate in inter-union staff training projects? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _5_, Question _3_.

4. Did the union hold resident schools (1 week or longer) for local officers, committeemen, stewards, or active members? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Pages _6&7_, Question _4_.

5. Did the union conduct conferences or institutes for local officers, committeemen, stewards, or active members? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Pages _7&8_, Question _5_.

6. Did the union conduct educational activity as a part of union conferences called for other purposes? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _9_, Question _6_.

7. Did the national union conduct continuing part-time classes for local unionists in the home communities of the workers? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _9_, Question _7_.

8. Did the union encourage local union educational activity? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, provide details on Page _10_, Question _8_.

9. Did the union carry on programs for retired members? Yes___ No___
   Did the union conduct pre-retirement education? Yes___ No___
   If Yes to either of these, provide details on Page _11_, Question _9_.

10. Did the union conduct programs for families of members? Yes___ No___
    If Yes, provide details on Page _12_, Question _10_.

Please answer also the questions on pages _12, 13, 14, 15, 16_, which do not relate to the above questions.

1. EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR FULL-TIME STAFF
JANUARY 1, 1965 - DECEMBER 31, 1966

Please send program announcements, class schedules, and reports if available. If possible, send also outlines of future plans.

Please list each different kind of program held, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966, and provide information requested.

Program Title	No. of Days	No. of Programs Like This	Total Parti-cipants	Special Character* of Staff (if any)	Special Character** of Program (if any)	Identify University (if one used)

---

* Such as new staff, permanent staff, nationally or regionally selected, responsibility with union if identifiable, etc.

** Such as major course titles, special emphases, if not clear from title.

2. PLANNED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AS PART OF STAFF MEETINGS
JANUARY 1, 1965 - DECEMBER 31, 1966

Please list each different kind of program held, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966, and provide information requested.

Type of Program	No. of Days	No. of Programs Like This	Total Parti-cipants	Special Character* of Staff (if any)	Special Character** of Program (if any)

* Such as new staff, permanent staff, nationally or regionally selected, responsibility within union if identifiable, etc.

** Such as major subjects, special emphases, if not clear from title.

3. **Does your union participate in inter-union staff training programs? Yes___ No___**

If Yes, please check the program and indicate the number of participants from your union during the period of this report, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966.

Name of Program	**No. of Participants**
___ **AFL-CIO Industrial Engineering Institute**	___
___ **AFL-CIO Collective Bargaining Institute**	___
___ **AFL-CIO Discussion Leadership Institute**	___
___ **NILE Southern Staff Training**	___
___ **Advanced Southern Labor School**	___
___ **Harvard Trade Union Program**	___
___ **Other (please identify)**	
________________________	___
________________________	___
________________________	___

4a. RESIDENT SCHOOLS, ONE WEEK OR LONGER, FOR LOCAL OFFICERS, COMMITTEEMEN, AND MEMBERS

Please list all such schools held during the two-year period, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966, and provide the information requested. Please send program announcements, reports, and other descriptive materials. If these include the information requested, there is no need to repeat it.

Place	Dates	Program or Programs*	No. of Students Each Program	Type of Group**

* If possible, differentiate between types of program, i.e., basic and advanced; first year, second year, etc.; presidents, stewards, COPE, etc.

** Officers, stewards, special committeemen, etc.

4b. Who pays the following union costs of one-week resident schools for local unionists?

"Costs" include money spent, not union staff time. Please check all appropriate spaces. List other patterns if there is variety.

	Student	National Union	Local Union	Divided Between National and Local
Lost Wages	___	___	___	___
Travel	___	___	___	___
Room and Board	___	___	___	___
Instruction (including materials)	___	___	___	___

5a. Conferences Conducted by National Union Education Staff January 1, 1965, - December 31, 1966

Full time, one-day: No. of conferences___ No. of participants___

Please list conference subjects.________________________________

____

____

____

Full time, two- or three-day: No. of conferences___ No. of participants___

Please list conference subjects.________________________________

____

____

____

If statistical information is not available, please indicate pattern of activity.

5b. Educational Conferences Conducted by Other Departments of National Union January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966

Full time, one-day: No. of conferences___ No. of participants___

Please list program titles.______________________________

____

____

____

Full time, two- or three-day: No. of conferences___ No. of participants___

Please list program titles.______________________________

____

____

____

If statistical information is not available, please indicate pattern of activity.

6. Planned Educational Activity as Part of Other Union Conferences January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966

	No. of Programs	No. of Participants
Education programs less than one day	___	___
One-day education programs	___	___
Education programs longer than one day	___	___

If possible, indicate character of programs. If statistical information is not available, please indicate pattern of activity.

7. Part-Time Classes, January 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966

Please provide the following information for part-time classes on a continuing basis conducted by the national union for members in their home communities.

No. of courses___ No. of students___

Common course titles: ______________________________

____

____

____

If statistics are not available, please indicate pattern of activity.

8. Methods Used to Develop Local Educational Activity

Does the union encourage the development of local education committees?

Yes___ No___ If Yes, please provide the following information:

Total no. of locals_____

No. of education committees (your best approximation) ____

No. of education committees with active programs
(your best approximation) ____

Does the education department have either special publications or a regular bulletin to encourage local educational activity? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please send samples.

Does the national union conduct special training sessions or conferences for education committee members? Yes___ No___ If Yes, please describe.

List other means used to develop local education activity.

9. Pre-retirement Education and Programs for Retirees

9a. Have you developed a national program of classes to prepare members for retirement? Yes___ No___

How many members participated in the two years, Jan. 1, 1965 - Dec. 31, 1966?
Number (if available)______

Do you have joint pre-retirement programs with employers? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please list major programs below.

9b. Do you have a national program of work with retired members? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please describe very briefly.

9c. Please describe briefly any educational programs for retired members sponsored by the national union.

10. Programs for Families of Members

Please describe briefly any special programs for wives or children of members sponsored by the national union.

11. Educational Programs for Elected National Union Officers

Do you conduct educational programs for elected national union officers such as members of the executive board? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please describe briefly or send descriptive literature.

12. Joint Programs with Management

12a. Do you conduct educational programs, other than preparation for retirement, jointly with management? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please list examples of companies and programs.
(Send descriptive literature if available.)

12. Joint Programs with Management (cont'd)

12b. Has your union negotiated for company contributions to cost of labor education activity? Yes___ No___ If Yes, check all appropriate spaces:

___Tuition ___Partial tuition ___Payment for lost time

Other (please list)________________________________

____

____

Please list examples of companies and types of programs.

13. Joint Educational Activity with Other Unions

Does your union engage in joint educational activity with other national unions? Yes___ No___ If Yes, please list unions below.

14. Please describe other educational activities of union during 1965 and 1966 such as (but not only) those in the following list. List special programs and new developments not otherwise included in this report. Please send descriptive literature if available.

Film production .... Film library .... Book distribution
Course outlines and other teaching materials...Literacy or general education
Publications ..... Work with public schools ... Union scholarship programs

15. UNION EDUCATION STAFF IN THE UNITED STATES

15a. Please indicate the number of national union staff assigned to the education activities of the union, including the director. Do not include staff who may occasionally promote or participate in educational activity

	Full-Time	Part-Time	If Part-Time, Approximate Portion of Time Spent on Education
Headquarters	____	____	______
Field	____	____	______

For headquarters part-time education staff, please check areas of responsibility other than education:

Research___ Political Action___ Community Services___

Organizing___ Bargaining___ Publicity, Editing___

Other (please list)____

____

____

15b. Do subordinate units of the union (locals, joint boards, joint councils, lodges, etc.) employ staff with specific assigned responsibility for education?

Yes___ No___ If Yes, No. full-time___ No. part-time___

16. FINANCING

Does your union's financial report indicate the amounts spent for education?

Yes___ No___ If Yes, please reproduce here, or send copy.

Appendix VII

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN 1966 BY LOCAL UNIONS AND OTHER SUBORDINATE UNITS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

Instructions

This questionnaire has been prepared to assist in obtaining information for a survey of labor education in the United States. The survey is conducted by the National Institute of Labor Education and financed by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. Similar information is sought from national and international unions, central labor bodies, university labor education programs, and other groups for the programs they conduct.

We are seeking information on union education programs other than skill training. Therefore we are not asking for reports on apprenticeship programs, the updating or upgrading of experienced workers, or other vocational programs. These are important but they are outside the area of our study.

In view of the number of sources we are using, we are requesting that the information provided be limited to the calendar year 1966 so that the data will be comparable. We have tried to make the questionnaire as simple as possible, but we do seek specific information.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to:

Labor Education Survey
National Institute of Labor Education at The American University
1911 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

We would also appreciate receiving any reports you may have issued on your program.

Name of National or International Union ____________________

Local No.____or Name of Subordinate Body ____________________

Address ____________________

City ______________ State ______________ Zip ________

Name and Title of Person Reporting ____________________

____

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY DURING 1966

Please check appropriate spaces for activity during 1966
and provide details as directed.

1. Did you conduct education activity at local union meetings? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 2, Question 1.

2. Did you conduct education activity at stewards' meetings? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 2, Question 2.

3. Did you conduct movie showings as an educational activity? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 2, Question 3.

4. Did you conduct continuing part-time classes for officers, committeemen, or members? (These are classes held for several sessions, usually before or after work.) Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 3, Question 4.

5. Did you send students to continuing part-time classes sponsored by other groups in your community? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 3, Question 5.

6. Did you sponsor educational conferences or institutes? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 4, Question 6.

7. Did you send students to full-time union schools sponsored by your national union or a state central labor body? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 4, Question 7.

8. Did you conduct programs to prepare members for retirement of or for those already retired? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 4, Question 8.

9. Did you conduct education programs for families of members? Yes___ No___
   If Yes, please provide details on Page 5, Question 9.

10. Do you have a union library for your members? Yes___ No___
    If Yes, please provide details on Page 5, Question 10.

11. Do you have an education committee? Yes___ No___
    If Yes, please provide details on Page 5, Question 11.

12. Do other committees sponsor education activity? Yes___ No___
    If Yes, please include their activity in this report and list committees on Page 5, Question 12.

13. Do you have a full-time staff representative who has responsibility for educational activity? Yes___ No___
    If Yes, please provide details on Page 5, Question 13.

1. Education at Local Meetings

Do you set aside some time at each meeting for education? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please describe briefly the kinds of educational activity at meetings.

2. Education at Meetings of Stewards or Committeemen

Do you have regular meetings of stewards or committeemen? Yes___ No___

Do you set aside time at each meeting for education? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please describe briefly the kinds of educational activity at these meetings.

3. Movie Showings in 1966

Number of showings at union meetings:_____ Number of other showings:_____

List the groups from which you obtained films.

4. Continuing Part-Time Classes Sponsored by the Union in 1966 (4 Sessions or More)

Total No.____ Total No. Students____

Course subjects (please indicate the number of classes in each)

___Steward Training
___Union Administration
___Collective Bargaining
___Leadership Skills
___Political Action
___Parliamentary Law
___Labor Legislation
___Community Services
___Adult Literacy or High School Equivalency
___Other (please list; use additional page if necessary, but note question no.)

If some or all of the classes were conducted by a university labor education program, please provide the following information needed for statistical analysis:

Name of university____

No. of classes conducted by university____ No. of students in such classes____

5. Participation in Part-Time Classes Sponsored by Other Groups

Please check the appropriate space for group sponsoring the classes to which you sent students.

___Central Labor Body
___University Labor Education Program
___Community Services
___Other (please list)

6. Educational Conferences and Institutes in 1966

	No. of Conferences	No. of Participants
One-Day Conferences	___	___
Two-Day Conferences	___	___

Please list conference titles.

7. Students Attending Full-Time Schools Sponsored by National Union or State Central Labor Body

Please indicate how these students are chosen by checking all appropriate spaces below.

___By virtue of office
___Chosen by officers
___Chosen by education committee
___Elected at local meeting
___Chosen by executive committee
___Other (please list)
___Volunteers

8. Education Programs for Retired Members, or in Preparation for Retirement

Please send descriptive material, if available, or describe briefly below. Indicate if pre-retirement programs are sponsored jointly with employer.

9. Education Programs for Families of Members

Please describe briefly any such programs.

10. Union Library

Estimated number of books_____ How many books bought in 1966?_____
How many books loaned out during 1966?_____

11. Education Committee

No. of members_____ No. of meetings in 1966____

12. Other Committees Sponsoring Education Activity in 1966 Please list.

13. Full-Time Staff Responsible for Education Please check appropriate spaces.

___Full time on Education
___Part time on Education (if part time, please check all other responsibilities):

___Skill Training ___Political Action ___Community Services
___Publicity ___Editing ___Organizing ___Servicing
___Other (please list)

USE ADDITIONAL PAGE OR PAGES TO DESCRIBE ANY OTHER EDUCATION ACTIVITY.

Appendix VIII

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STATE CENTRAL BODIES - INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire has been prepared to assist in obtaining information for a survey of labor education in the United States being conducted by the National Institute of Labor Education, financed by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The AFL-CIO Department of Education is cooperating in the study.

We are seeking information on union education programs other than skill training. Therefore we are not interested in apprenticeship programs, or the updating or upgrading of experienced workers. We are interested in adult literacy or high school equivalency.

The questionnaire has been prepared to provide comparable information from unions, universities, and other groups conducting labor education programs. We are seeking information on state central body activity during 1966. If you have started new programs in 1967 that you would like to call to our attention, please list them on the last page and send us announcements or other material about them.

Please fill out the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to the National Institute of Labor Education, address given above. We have set September 5, 1967, as the deadline for returning the questionnaires.

--0--

Name of Central Body____

Address____

City______________________ State_______________ Zip____

Name and Title of Staff Member in Charge of Education________________

____

Approximate proportion of time spent on educational activity (please check appropriate space): __full time __2/3 __1/2 __1/3 __1/4 __less than 1/4

Do other staff members regularly conduct educational activity? Yes__ No__
If Yes, please provide information requested below:

Name______________________Title___________________________

Name______________________Title___________________________

The following pages provide space to report educational activity conducted by the state central body during 1966.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN 1966

1. CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

Please list all educational conferences and institutes held during 1966 and provide information requested.

Location	No. of Days	Title or Purpose	No. of Participants	Cooperating Organization (if any) (Provide name of university or other group.)

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN 1966

2. ONE-WEEK SCHOOLS

Please list all one-week schools held in 1966 and provide information requested. If your state AFL-CIO participated in a school jointly with other state central bodies, list the school and indicate number of students from your state.

Program Title	Dates	No. of Students	Cooperating Organization (if any) (Provide name of university or other group.)

3. SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Please list any special education programs you may have held during 1966 and provide the information requested. Send report if available.

Title or Purpose	No. of Days	Special Characteristics	Cooperating Organization (if any) (Provide name of university or other group.)

4. OTHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY

4a. Do you have a film library? Yes___ No___
If Yes, how many film showings during 1966:

By staff of state AFL-CIO?___ By others?___

4b. Do you have a special program of work with schools? Yes___ No___
If Yes, please check activities conducted:

___Regular distribution of literature to students or teachers

___Speakers at classes

___Scholarship program

___Provision of books to school libraries

___Other (please indicate)________________________________

Please list any other educational activity you may conduct.

Appendix IX

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LOCAL CENTRAL BODIES - INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire has been prepared to assist in obtaining information for a survey of labor education in the United States being conducted by the National Institute of Labor Education, financed by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The AFL-CIO Department of Education is cooperating in the study.

We are seeking information on union education programs other than skill training. Therefore we are not interested in apprenticeship programs, or the updating or upgrading of experienced workers. We are interested in adult literacy or high school equivalency.

The questionnaire has been prepared to provide comparable information from unions, universities, and other groups conducting labor education programs. We are seeking information on local central body activity during 1966. If you have started new programs in 1967 that you would like to call to our attention, please list them on the last page and send us announcements or other material about them.

Please fill out the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to the National Institute of Labor Education, address given above. We have set September 5, 1967, as the deadline for returning the questionnaires.

--0--

Name of Central Body____

Address ____

City____________________ State______________Zip________

Name and Title of Person Reporting______________________________

____

1. Do you have a central labor body education committee? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please provide the information requested below:

Name of Chairman ______________________________

Union Affiliation and Position ______________________

____

How many times did the committee meet during 1966? ___

2. Do other committees of the central labor body sponsor education activity? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please include their activity in this report and list committees below.

The following pages provide space to report educational activity sponsored by the central labor body in 1966.

3. CONTINUING PART-TIME CLASSES HELD IN 1966

(These are classes held before or after work, meeting several times.)

Please list all such classes and provide information requested.

Course Title	No. of Ses- sions	Name of Organization Conducting Program (if outside group was used)	No. of Students

4. CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES HELD DURING 1966

Please list all such conferences and institutes and provide information requested.

Program Title	No. of Days	Names of Cooperating Organizations (if you used outside groups)	No. of Participants

5. Do you work with local schools or students? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please check activities conducted:

___Regular distribution of literature to students or teachers

___Speakers in classes, on request

___Speakers in classes, regular program

___Scholarship program

___Provision of books for school libraries

___Other (please list)____

____

6. Do you cooperate in programs with local library? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please describe programs briefly in space below:

7. Other Educational Activity

Please list below and describe briefly other educational activity conducted in 1966.

Appendix X

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LABOR EDUCATION
AT THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
1911 F STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 TELEPHONE: 202-737-1366

SURVEY OF LABOR EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire has been developed to gather material for a survey of labor education in the United States. For the purposes of the survey, labor education is defined as educational activity for workers, directed to them as unionists, intended to improve their knowledge and skills as unionists or to enable them to function more effectively in society with regard to their social, economic, and cultural interests. Labor education does not include skill training as traditionally conducted in vocational education.

This questionnaire, directed to state directors of vocational education, is intended to help identify labor education activities which may be supported by vocational education funds. We are gathering information for the 1966 calendar year. If your answers cover a different period, please indicate here: From____________________ To ____________________ .

--0--

Name of Person Filling Out Questionnaire________________________________

Address____

City__________________________ State_________________ Zip___________

Voc. Ed.

Are federal, state, or local vocational education funds used to support labor education activity (as defined in "Instructions" above) in your state? Yes___ No___

If Yes, please indicate how the programs are conducted by checking the appropriate spaces below and supplying the requested information.

___ Program conducted as part of the state vocational education activity. (Please supply name and address of person in charge.)

____

____

(City) (State) (Zip)

___ Grants to universities or colleges, either for regular programs or special projects.
(Please list the institutions and persons in charge.)

____

____

____

____

___ Grants to local vocational education programs for labor education activity. (Please list communities and supply name and address of person in charge of labor education activity or familiar with it.)

Voc. Ed.

In your state how much vocational education money was spent in 1966 for labor education activity?

Federal vocational education funds: $__________

State vocational education funds: $__________

Local vocational education funds: $__________

ERIC Clearinghouse
DEC 3 1968
on Adult Education